# NATIONAL ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD.

SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, Editor.

Without Concealment----Without Compromise.

JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL, Corresponding Editor.

VOLUME IX.---NO. 20.

NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 12, 1848.

WHOLE NUMBER 436.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY,
BY THE
AMERICAN A. S. SOCIETY
AT 142 NASSAU STREET NEW-YORK.

☞ All communications for the paper, and letters relating to its pecuniary concerns, should be addressed to the Editor.

☞ Donations to the Treasury of the American Anti-Slavery Society may be forwarded to FRANCIS JACKSON Treasurer, at Boston; or to S. H. Gay, Assistant Treasurer, at New-York.

TERMS.—Two Dollars per annum: Strictly in advance in all cases.


## Selections.

From the Christian Register.

### INFLUENCE OF ABOLITION EFFORTS ON SLAVERY AT THE SOUTH.

To bring before our readers what we have to say on this subject, we will quote again, from Mr. Webster's speech, the paragraph which appeared in the *Register* of the 9th inst:

"I say that all agitations and attempts to disturb the relations between master and slave, by persons not living in the slave States, are unconstitutional in their spirit, and are, in my opinion, productive of nothing but evil and mischief. I countenance none of them. The manner in which the Government of those States where Slavery exists are to regulate it, is for their own consideration, under their responsibility to their constituents, to the general laws of propriety, humanity and justice, and to God. Associations formed elsewhere, springing from a feeling of humanity, or any other cause, have nothing whatever to do with it. They have never received encouragement from me, and they never will. In my opinion, they have done nothing but to delay and defeat their own professed objects."

What are the professed objects of the associations and efforts alluded to? The main object is of course the abolition of Slavery. Subordinate to this, though not directly aimed at, is the melioration of the condition of the slave, while in Slavery. We have often heard it said, indeed, and seen it stated, that the efforts at the North only made the planters more harsh and severe; that the disposition cherished in the slave through Northern agitation, obliged the slaveholders in self-defence, to extend fewer privileges, and adopt a more rigorous system of servitude. But all this is contrary to actual fact. Go to the South, and you will hear Southerners plainly speak of the mitigations in the lot of the slave, especially within the last twenty years. He is better fed, better clothed, less overworked, less cruelly treated. We should expect such a result from the alleged fact, even if it were true, that Abolitionists have greatly exaggerated in their accounts of the cruelties of the slave system. We should expect that slaveholders, where the accusations have been so loud and so wide, and, to say the least, have had such plausible grounds in facts that could not be gainsayed,—we should expect that they would adopt a milder treatment as a practical refutation of the charges alleged.

But whoever has travelled much through the South, has seen too much to confirm the statements of Abolitionists—only their statements have been to sweeping—have been made in universal terms, without recognizing great and noble exceptions. We have been on a plantation, where the system, save in that one respect—Slavery—for which we will offer no kindness in the master as an apology or offset,—has been nearly paternal—we will say far more so than any relation between master and apprentices that we have ever known. And we have also seen, with our own eyes, and heard with our own ears, instances of cruelty, especially among the more ignorant of the slaveholders in the interior, which have made every drop of blood in our veins flow faster with indignation. We remember, in Liberty County, Georgia, only six miles from Midway, a Northern colony, originally from Dorchester, and regarded as one of the most distinguished counties at the South for religion and education, and the attention paid to the welfare of the slave,—we remember to have heard, from two aged women in a log-house in the pine woods, an account of a scene at one of their neighbours, at which they hastened home in anguish. We once heard, too, as we stood by the bed-side of a member of the Methodist church, who was very ill, in that same county, the following confession:—"O, if God will spare my life, I will be more kind to my slaves." We have heard admissions of cruelties practised, from the lips of some of the most intelligent Southerners. With exceptions in favour of, we will hope, many humane masters, we cannot but feel that the statements of Abolitionists respecting the cruelties of the slave system, have been true in the general, true within the last twenty years. If a different aspect is now really exhibited at the South—if kindness is now the rule, and cruelty the exception, (which we by no means see evidence of) then has the change been effected within the time during which special abolition efforts have been made. Give, as we may, to the progress of civilization, some of the credit of this less cruel treatment of men unjustly held in bondage—a bondage which no kindness can extenuate—there will remain a vast deal which would never have been witnessed but through the agency of the voice and the press at the North, which exposed the cruelties practised.

It is urged, moreover, that the agitation of the Slavery question in the free States has only retarded and defeated Abolition of Slavery itself; and this, we suppose, is what Mr. Webster specially alludes to. Where and what is the evidence of this? The only plausible reason we have ever seen or heard assigned, is, that Virginia and Kentucky were once on the very eve of of emancipation, but were drawn back by this Anti-Slavery agitation. Now the strength of the emancipation feeling in those States was in the western part of the former, and the eastern part of the latter, where Slavery, in consequence of the nature of the soil, and surface of the country, and climate, never was profitable, and never dominant. In the other parts—in east Virginia and Kentucky west—the slave interest was strong, and had a majority which never showed any purpose to emancipate. Moreover, about the time of the up-springing of the Anti-Slavery movement, there rose a demand for slaves in our Southern and South western territories, which made it profitable to breed slaves in Virginia and Kentucky, and thoughts of emancipation, if they had ever been cherished, dissolved before the newly opened prospects of gain. Any real retrograde movement from incipient emancipation back to Slavery, through the agitation of the subject at the North, has, at least in our opinion, never taken place.

For ourselves we are constrained to believe that the South, if left to itself, would never free itself from Slavery. In the first place, the evil seems so appalling even to those at the South who desire the Abolition of Slavery, that they dare not attempt its removal. As one of them has quite recently expressed it, they "suffer under a present heavy evil with an obscured future." They can neither act vigorously, nor act at all. They look forward to a day of emancipation as one so surrounded with difficulties and disasters, as to make them wish to be in their graves, before the storm shall come—which nevertheless they foresee must come. They are for leaving all to an overruling Providence, which shall bring it about in the appointed time. Mr. Appleton, in his letter to Mr. Danforth, (see *Register* of September, 2.) expresses the opinion of many Southern Christian men when he thus gives his own:—"On the whole, I consider the question of the abolition of Slavery in the United States, one of those great and difficult problems entirely beyond the power of man to solve. Fortunately events of this kind are controlled by a wiser and higher power, on which we may rely with perfect confidence that they will work together for good."

But when has God wrought any great reform, except as man has wrought with God? What great good has been attained for man, except as man has been co-worker with God? To take the position here recommended, is to stay in Herculaneum and Pompeii on the eve of an overwhelming eruption of Vesuvius. It is the tendency of evil,—and Slavery is no exception, but a singular confirmation,—to increase and become more formidable, until, if let alone, it bursts with destructive power on the devoted heads of those exposed to it. Every day's delay of emancipation increases its difficulty makes the relations of the slave system more complex, and their dissolution more formidable to those whom it concerns. There is needed, then, interposition from the North to urge and encourage those, who sincerely wish for emancipation, to engage in it now, at the present hour, when the work is more difficult than it was twenty years ago, but less difficult than it will be any day to come. Engaging willingly in the work, difficult though it seems, God will be their helper, and man's extremity will prove, as ever, God's opportunity.

In the second place, there is a large class,—the majority of the Southern church,—who believe the system is sanctioned by the New Testament. Not that their consciences are all satisfied that Slavery is not a wrong, nor one of the evils intended to be removed from the earth by the operation of the gospel. But it is *tolerated for a season*, and *they* are among those in whom God's will tolerates it—a state of mind worse than any conceivable for doing anything to remove the evil. Will they, with no promptings and rebukes from without, be likely to engage in the work of emancipation?

Again, there are others, who, led on by Mr. McDuffie and Mr. Calhoun, express their attachment to Slavery, their determination to adhere to it at all hazards, their resolution to secede from the union, rather than give up their slave institutions. This may be a minority in fact. But it is a powerful minority, able, thus far, to brow-beat and overpower any of the numerous class, who desire to see Slavery abolished but have not the courage to attempt it.

In the midst of all these difficulties, if in the free States men should hold their peace, this curse of Slavery would go on accumulating, and the day of emancipation never arrive. There is needed to be brought to bear on the South a strong public opinion; that public opinion which is the most formidable antagonist to wrong and oppression. And here we cannot but quote from Mr. Webster's speech on the Greek Revolution, sentiments utterly irreconcileable with his position in respect to Slavery:

"The time has been, indeed, when fleets and armies, and subsidies, were the *principal* reliances even in the best cause. But, happily for mankind, there has arrived a great change in this respect. Moral causes come into consideration, in proportion as the progress of knowledge is advanced; and the *public opinion* of the civilized world is rapidly gaining an ascendancy over mere brutal force. It is already able to oppose the most formidable obstruction, to the progress of injustice and oppression; and, as it grows more intelligent and more intense, it will be more and more formidable. It may be silenced by military power, but it cannot be conquered. It is elastic, irrepressible, and invulnerable, to the weapons of ordinary warfare. It is that impassible, unextinguishable enemy of mere violence and arbitrary rule, which like Milton's angels,

'Vital in every part,
Cannot, but by annihilating, die,'

Until this be propitiated or satisfied, it is vain for power to talk either of triumphs or of repose. No matter what fields are desolated, what fortresses surrendered, what armies subdued, or what provinces overrun. In the history of the year that has passed by us, and in the instance of unhappy Spain, we have seen the vanity of all triumphs, in a cause which violates the general sense of justice of the civilized world. It is nothing, that the troops of France have passed from the Pyrenees to Cadiz; it is nothing that an unhappy and prostrate nation has fallen before them; it is nothing that arrests, and confiscation, and execution, sweep away the little remnant of national resistance. There is an enemy that still exists to check the glory of these triumphs. It follows the conqueror back to the very scene of his ovations; it calls upon him to take notice that Europe, *though silent*, is yet indignant; it shows him that the sceptre of victory is a barren sceptre; that it shall confer neither joy nor honour, but shall moulder to dry ashes in his grasp. In the midst of his exultation, *it* pierces his ear with the cry of injured justice, it denounces against him the indignation of an enlightened and civilized age; it turns to bitterness the cup of his rejoicing, and wounds him with the sting which belongs to the consciousness of having outraged the opinion of mankind." Vol. 1, p, 253.

We add, also, from his speech on South American Independence, the following:

"If it be weak to rejoice, when, even in any corner of the earth, human beings are able to get up from beneath oppression, to erect themselves, and to enjoy the proper happiness of their intelligent nature; if this be weak, it is a weakness *from* which I claim no exemption."—p. 349.

We will not think this the orator's rhetorical flourish, nor that the maturity of age would pronounce these the offspring of the enthusiasm of his youth. Mr. Webster feels a difficulty from the compromises of the Constitution. "They are unconstitutional in their spirit"—these "agitations," he says. And why unconstitutional? Mr. Webster does not tell us why. These compromises of the Constitution, what are they? What were they meant to be? Is it to be supposed for a moment, that those in the free States, who consented to them, thereby bound themselves hand and foot and tongue, from doing anything immediately or by associated effort, to procure the abolition of Slavery? Not so thought Franklin, the President of the first Abolition Society in the country.

But do these compromises really bind us? Have we, in fact, made the oath, which we cannot break in honour? Are we caught in a trap? Mr. Webster might so argue in a court where the letter of the law binds, but not where he himself appeals to "the *spirit* of the Constitution."

No, there is nothing in the compromises of the General Government which binds as from attempting to procure the abolition of that in view of which the compromises were made. And since it exists longer than the fathers of the Constitution supposed, and grows by neglect, our duty is the more urgent. Nay, since we at the North can see the evil working of Slavery on our brethren at the South, our duty arising from the spirit of the Constitution, is to exert ourselves in their behalf. To say that Slavery is their look out, not ours in the free States, is to pass by with the priest and the Levite on the other side. And still father—since we feel the evil affecting us at the North so deeply, our duty to ourselves urges us to efforts for its removal.

But the negro is our brother also—far more than the South American in Panama, or the Greek on the isles of the Aegean or the shores of the Mediterranean. It is poor consistency to urge and favour movements in Congress in behalf of men oppressed by other nations, and discourage and denounce movements in behalf of our oppressed at home. By whatever instrumentality a "*public sentiment*" may be directed against Slavery, and made "more intelligent, more intense and more formidable," let it be welcomed, let it be encouraged, let it have free course.

From the Globe.

### SLAVERY IN MISSOURI.

The people of Missouri are growing uneasy upon the question of Slavery. They find that emigration to that State is much less, on account of the existence of Slavery. They begin to demand legislative action, fixing some near period when a slave cannot be born in the State.

From an article in a recent number of the *St Louis People's Daily Organ*, written by a citizen of Missouri, having been long a resident of that State, one whose interests are all identified with those of the State, we should judge that it was seriously contemplated to bring the subject of Slavery before the Legislature now about to convene. The writer says:

It is believed that any legislative measures taken—if they are as they ought to be—judicious and careful of the rights of property—can be carried through the Assembly without opposition or agitation. It is believed that the community generally are now ripe for such means.

The arguments of the writer in favour of the extinction of the institution, are admirably stated.—They all have a bearing upon the interests and prosperity of the State. He asserts the undeniable fact, that communities grow much faster in latitudes as high as Missouri, *without* Slavery than *with* it.—"This fact," says the writer, "is so clear that, in this State, the important truth is every day creating a deeper and livelier impression upon the public mind." So deep is this impression that immediate measures to rid, gradually, the State from Slavery, will be taken.

The following extract will show the motive that will induce prompt action on the part of the people of that State:

It is, we think, true that Slavery here, although it should be left to itself, will expire from the operation of natural causes, within a comparatively short period of time. Yet, though this is the belief of many, there is a very large body of our citizens who wish to turn that belief into certainty. They wish, when they invite immigrants to our fine soil and climate—and our immense mineral facilities—to be able to show them the incontrovertible evidences and assurances that Slavery will cease to exist in Missouri from and after a certain date. Tell enterprising, industrious, and patriotic farmers, miners, mechanics, and manufacturers abroad, that you have no doubt that Slavery will cease here shortly—that natural causes favour that belief—and they will probably reply that perhaps you are right, but that nevertheless "there is no knowing." Show them, however, an act of the Legislature, which declares that no person born in this State after the fourth of July, eighteen hundred and sixty, shall be held as a slave, and you then at once convince them that Slavery has touched its limit here. From the passage of such an act, Missouri will be regarded all over the United States and Europe, as a free State. The thousands of immigrants, who now avoid us and make for territories north of us, will come here, and Missouri will be, in developed resources, what she is naturally, the richest State in the Union. There are *many* reasons why immigrants should prefer Missouri, supposing Slavery extinct here. Her position is central—her soil as fertile as any in the Union—her mines probably richer—and her climate as healthy as any region of the Mississippi valley, from St. Anthony to Belize.

Missouri has sometimes been spoken of as a point to which the seat of the National Government might be fitly transferred. It is in many respects a fit point. It is central—looking at the vast territory West as well as East of us, and it is easily accessible by means of the Mississippi and its tributaries. The new Constitution, as approved by the Convention, offered the cession of the jurisdiction over the tract near us—embracing the town of Carondalet—for the establishment, if desired, of the National seat of Government. The locality is unobjectionable; and in one contingency, we should by no means despair of seeing Carondalet and its neighbourhood, rise to the dignity of the Capital of the United States. There is a contingency, however, which must make all such hopes idle—and that is the continued existence of SLAVERY here. Once assure the nation that that existence is limited—once let the people know for a certainty that Missouri is actually or in immediate prospect, a FREE STATE—and we may rely upon it, that her chances for securing the establishment of the Capital are quite equal to those of any State in the Union.

Mr. Russell Jarvis has recently addressed, through the *Globe*, a series of able letters to an intolerant and pro-Slavery Jew of this city, the descendant of a Hebrew slave, and one whose birth—stamped plainly on his features—would even at this day, all over Europe, degrade him to precisely the same relative position as the "nigger" of the United States. We copy from one of the letters of Mr. Jarvis, an ingenious argument on the Bible question. According to it, anybody who shall catch Major Noah, and put *him* on a Southern plantation under an overseer, will be fulfilling the Scriptures, at the same time that he will perform an act of poetical justice:

TO MAJOR NOAH:—I have promised a reply to your suggestion upon the Divine origin of African Slavery. You ask how I, while acknowledging a revealed religion, can consider Slavery as a curse and a sin, since we cannot equalize the condition of mankind, and must take the world as it has been prepared for us, and as we find it? You say that God has decreed Slavery, and that we have no right to interfere with His revelation, or impiously arrest the progress of his covenant; that He has made a distinction between races in the distinction of colour, and that these races cannot be reconciled or united by the conventional rules of Society; that, in the Commandments, He has consecrated Slavery as property in the "man-servant" and the "maid-servant;" that He has surrendered the coloured race to the whites as "bondmen forever;" that Moses, finding Slavery an established and inevitable condition of society, regulated it by a code of laws; that Paul, by apprehending and sending home a fugitive slave, impliedly sanctioned Slavery. You warn me against being misled by conventional expounders, who deny that the word *slave* is in the *Bible*, for it is *there*, as well as in the New Testament. You add that, a transcendental religion and philosophy may construe the Bible according to their wishes, and substitute for it their own laws and ordinances; but you, belonging to the race chosen by the Almighty, as witnesses of his Unity and Omnipotence, have no other guide than the Bible, "in its plain, palpable meaning," and *there* find Slavery recognized and regulated.

I shall endeavour to answer this in the same candid spirit in which it is offered; and as I may differ with both Jews and Christians in constructing the Bible, I may as well begin with a *Confession of Faith*, and thus guard, if possible, against that imputation of *infidelity* which some self-styled Christians always raise against all who do not stand upon their own platform. You are a Jew, and therefore believe in the unity of God, and the inspiration of the Bible. I agree with you in *both*, and also agree with you in regarding the Jews as *the elder brethren of the Christian Church*. But I also believe in the inspiration of the New Testament, and that the Jews will forever remain a distinct people, as living witnesses to the truth of Christianity. My Judaism may not be acceptable to Israel, nor my Christianity to the Gentiles. But either is sufficient to show that I do not assail the divine origin of Slavery by a denial of Revelation. Admitting both the Hebrew and the Greek Scriptures, I deny that either of them recognize Slavery as an inevitable, immutable condition, and more especially deny that either of them refer to *African* Slavery.

You will probably refer, for the foundation of African Slavery, to the curse pronounced upon Canaan by Noah. "And he said, cursed be Canaan; a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren."—Gen. ix. 25. The sin here denounced was committed by Ham, the father of Canaan, and not by Canaan in person. To involve Africa in this curse, you must show that Noah, in mentioning Canaan, referred to Ham and all his posterity; or that Canaan was the only son of Ham, and that the posterity of Canaan inhabited Africa. *From the Bible you can show neither, and I can show to the contrary.* Ham, though the sinner, was not included in the curse upon Canaan; Ham had three sons besides Canaan; and *none* of Canaan's posterity went to Africa. Ham, though the sinner, was not punished directly in his own person. Josephus says that Noah spared Ham "by reason of his nearness in blood, but cursed his posterity; and when the rest of them escaped that curse, God inflicted it on the children of Canaan."—Jos. book 1, chap. vi. sec. 3. We might well ask why Noah should punish Canaan for a fault in which he had no agency. But Josephus, a Jew, and therefore good authority among the Jews, gives the reason; and we must either take that reason, offer another, or dispense with any, for the Bible gives none. In mentioning Canaan, did Noah include *all* the posterity of Ham? The latter had four sons, Cush, Miziraim, Phut, and Canaan. Gen. x. 6. In this curse, Canaan, the youngest, according to the order in which they are named, is selected, singled out, separated from the other three. Why was this, excepting to save his three elder brothers from the curse, and visit it upon himself exclusively? As a lawyer, you understand the two rules of law and logic, *enumeration weakens in cases not enumerated, and exceptions strengthens in cases not excepted.* In the curse, Canaan is enumerated, and therefore the probability of its application to his brothers is *weakened* by this enumeration. And in the blessings bestowed upon Shem and Japeth in the next two verses, Canaan, and not Ham and his posterity, is excepted, and therefore the probability of the exclusive application of the curse to Canaan is *strengthened* by this exception. These rules are founded in the nature of things cognizable by reason, are recognized by the common sense of mankind, and are therefore as applicable to the Bible as to any other book, or any work or declaration of God or man. But in addition to these rules, we have the direct authority of Josephus, who says that, "*when the rest of them* (meaning the children of Ham) *escaped that curse, God inflicted it on the children of Canaan.*"

Thus, for the confinement of this curse in Canaan and his posterity, we have the text of Genesis, the commentary of Josephus, and two fundamental rules of logic, founded in the very nature of things, and recognized by the common sense of mankind.

I now proceed to show, that neither Canaan nor his posterity ever inhabited Africa. The posterity of Canaan were Sidon, Heth, and the Jebusite, Amorite, Girgasbite, Hivite, Arkite, Sinite, Arvadite, Zemarite, and Hamathite. Not one of these names designates any African tribe. I challenge anybody to produce the *slightest* evidence of African applicability in any one of them, from any historian, any commentator upon the sacred writings, of acknowledged authority, ancient or modern. Josephus tells us that they were applied to Asiatic and European, and not to African tribes. He says that the sons of Canaan were Sidonians, who built the city of Sidon, which, as we both know, was on the Asiatic coast of the Mediterranean; Amathus, (the Hamathite,) who inhabited that part of Greece "which the Macedonians called Epiphania:" Aradus, (the Aradite,) who possessed the island Aradus; Aracus, [the Arkite,] "who possessed Arehi, which is in Libanus," (Lebanon.)—"But of the seven others," says Josephus. "Chetteus, [Heth;] Jebuseus, [the Jebusite;] Amoreus, [the Amorite;] Georgeseus, [the Girgasite;] Eudeus, [the Arvadite;] Sineus, (the Sinite;) Samaseus, [the Zemarite;] we have nothing in the sacred books but their names, for the Hebrews overthrew their cities; and their calamities came upon them upon the occasion following." He then relates, as this *occasion following* the sin of Ham, and the curse pronounced upon Canaan, adding: "And when Noah was made sensible of what had been done, he prayed for prosperity for his other sons; but for Ham, he did not curse him, by reason of his nearness in blood, but cursed his posterity; and when the rest of them [meaning the rest of Ham's children, Cush, Mizraim, and Phut,] escaped that curse, God inflicted it on the children of Canaan."—Jos., book I., chap. vi., sec. 2.—So, according to Josephus, the three first sons of Ham, and their posterity escaped the curse; it fell exclusively upon Canaan and his posterity, and all the posterity of Canaan were Asiatic or European, But to remove all doubt, I refer you to Genesis x., 19, which says, "And the border of the Canaanites was from Sidon, as thou goest to Gerah unto Gaza; as thou goest unto Sodom and Gomorrah, and Admah, and Zeboim, and even unto Dathan." This description covers all that part of Syria afterwards called Palestine. It contained the very tribes mentioned by Josephus as conquered by the Hebrews, and among them the Jebusites, *the founders of Jerusalem!* And in accordance with Genesis, Josephus says, "Canaan, the fourth son of Ham, inhabited the country now called Judea, and called it from his own name, Canaan." Then as the posterity of Canaan never got nearer to Africa than Palestine, which is in Asia, the curse pronounced against them is no warrant for African Slavery.

Having traced Canaan to Palestine, I will leave him for a moment, in search of his elder brothers, who were excluded from the curse by necessary implication in Genesis, and are expressly excluded from it by Josephus. Ham's eldest son was Cush, the father of Nimrod, who founded *Babylon*. "And the beginning of his kingdom was Babel, and Erech, and Accad, and Calneth, in the land of Shinar. And out of that land went forth Ashur, and built Nineveh, and the city Rehoboth, and Calah, and Resen, between Nineveh and Calah: the same is a great city." Gen. x. 10, 11, 12. Do you find African locality in any of these names? They are well known as Asiatic. I know that, according to Josephus, Cush, whom he calls Chus, reigned in Ethiopia, and that, in his day, the Ethiopians were called Chusites by all the Asiatics. But while I admit Josephus as authority when he agrees with Genesis, I certainly do not when he contradicts it; and he *does* contradict Genesis in carrying to Ethiopia that posterity of Cush, which it confines to that region of Asia between the Euphrates and Tigris, called by the Greeks Mesopotamia, or *the land between the rivers*. Genesis gives as the posterity of Mizraim, the second son of Ham, and, like Cush, excepted from the curse, certain names which have an Asiatic appearance, and among which is *Philistine*. This signifies the *Philistines*, synonymous with the Tyrians, who did not inhabit Africa. Josephus says that the Egyptians were descended from Mizraim, the name of their ancestor being preserved in *Mestre*, the name certainly applied to Egypt by the Jews of his day. Admitting this, I urge that the Egyptians, however politically enslaved, have never been in social servitude, and that, in remote antiquity, they were a powerful people, the masters of other nations, and especially of the Jews. Hence, if the posterity of Ham, they could not have been included in a curse which condemned its subjects to be *the servants of servants*. Of Phut, Ham's third son, I can find no account in the Bible, excepting in Gen. x. 6, which merely says, "And the sons of Ham; Cush, and Mizraim, and Phut, and Canaan." Josephus says that Phut founded Libya. This is Northern Africa, the country of the Moors, who have never been slaves, but, as Carthagenians, were masters of the Mediterranean before the Christian era, and of Spain in the middle ages.

From this review of Genesis and Josephus, which can present nothing new to an Israelite of your erudition, you will perceive that the children of Canaan, the only heirs of the curse, never got nearer to Africa than Palestine; that the eldest son of Ham was confined to Mesopotamia, in Asia; that if the second son of Ham entered Egypt, which is in Africa, and the Egyptians are his posterity, they have never been slaves; that, if the third son of Ham entered Libya, which is also in Africa, his posterity have been masters, but never slaves; and that, wherever the three first sons of Ham went, they were excepted from the curse. Where, then, is your warrant for African Slavery, in the curse pronounced upon Canaan?—Even if all the posterity of Ham were African, which is not the fact, only a fourth part could be reached by the curse. But only two branches of his posterity were African, and the only branch covered by the curse were especially *Asiatic*. And where is your warrant even for tracing the negroes to Ham? For aught that appears in Genesis to the contrary, they may be the posterity of Shem or Japheth. Admitting, with Josephus, that the posterity of Mizraim went to Egypt, and that of Phut to Libya, neither the Egyptians nor the Moors have ever been negroes. And admitting, with Josephus, that the negroes, under the name of Ethiopians, were the posterity of Cush, though Genesis confines that posterity to Asia, still I urge that both Genesis and Josephus confine the curse to Canaan, and thereby except Cush, the first impliedly, the second expressly. If, then, the negroes be the posterity of Ham, they must be so through Cush, who *was not* cursed, and cannot be so through Canaan, who alone *was* cursed. And even if you trace the negroes to Mizraim or Phut, you reach the same result—their exemption from the curse. They certainly *are not* the posterity of Canaan, and Canaan certainly *was* the sole object of the curse,

But this is not all. The posterity of Canaan being confined to Palestine, and there conquered by the Israelites, what, we ask, became of them? They were either totally exterminated, or were reduced to Slavery by the conquerors, according to the universal custom of antiquity. The Bible does not tell us that all were exterminated. But if they were, the curse was accomplished in them and ended with them, and became extinct. They, the sole representatives of Canaan, being exterminated, could have no posterity, and consequently the curse could have no heirs beyond them. To speak reverently in legal phrase, it became like a lapsed legacy or an escheated estate, and reverted to the original source, to be bestowed upon some other; and as the Bible mentions no such second grant, of course we must now regard it as having served its intended purpose, and become extinct. If the Canaanites were not totally exterminated, but the greater or any portion were reduced to Slavery, then they remained as a distinct people in the midst of their masters, like the African race in our slave States, or became gradually incorporated with them. We find in the history of the Jews, after they became firmly established in the promised land, no evidence of such separate existence of the Canaanites. They are not mentioned as such in Samuel, Kings, or Chronicles, or by any of the Prophets before the captivity of Babylon. Nor are they mentioned in Ezekiel, Daniel, Ezra, or Nehemiah, as a distinct people, during, or after their return from, such captivity. Nor are they so mentioned in any book of the Apocrypha. And if you admit the Evangelists as historians, you find no such evidence in any one of them. Nor did they exist as such in the time of Josephus. Then in the absence of all such evidence, we must infer that they did not remain as a distinct people in Slavery, like our negroes, but were gradually incorporated with and lost in the Jews. Did the curse still follow them?—Then was it transmitted to the Jews by this mixture of blood. As this extinction of the Canaanites, through incorporation with their conquerors, must have been complete before the captivity of the ten tribes, and as these ten tribes became social slaves by this captivity, we might say that *they* were heirs of the curse. But while the *two* remaining tribes, the ancestors of all the present Jews, were social slaves during the Babylonian captivity, they were socially free after their return, till their conquest by Titus, a period of about six hundred years. And though great numbers were sold into Slavery after the capture of Jerusalem by Titus, yet as a distinct people, they do not appear to have been social slaves since that event. Though dispersed among all nations, and treated with excessive severity, especially by Christians, they do not seem to have been more than political slaves. But if this excessive political Slavery, in Europe among Christians, and in Asia among Mahommedans, has made them *the servants of servants*, then so far they *may be* the heirs of Noah's curse. I do not believe that they are; for I believe that the curse was fulfilled in the conquest of the Canaanites, and gradually expired with their distinct nationality. But to those who maintain that the curse still exists, and in the negroes, I reply that, if it exists at all, the Jews alone are its heirs; for neither the Bible nor any other book contains the slightest evidence of its descent to any other people.

I shall next answer your suggestions about the biblical sanction of Slavery as an inevitable condition of society, and shall hope to prove that the Bible contains no warrant for perpetual Slavery.

RUSSEL JARVIS.

NEW YORK, September 25, 1848.

From the North Star.

### F. DOUGLASS'S LETTER TO H. G. WARNER, ESQ. (EDITOR OF THE ROCHESTER COURIER.)

SIR:—My reasons—I will not say my apology, for addressing to you this letter, will become evident, by perusing the following brief statement of facts.

About the middle of August of the present year—deeply desiring to give my daughter, a child between nine and ten years old, the advantages of a good school—and learning that "Seward Seminary" of this city was an institution of that character—I applied to its principal, Miss Tracy, for the admission of my daughter into that Seminary. The principal—after making suitable inquiries into the child's mental qualifications, and informing me of the price of tuition per term, agreed to receive the child into the school at the commencement of the September term. Here we parted. I went home, rejoicing that my child was about to enjoy advantages for improving her mind, and fitting her for an honourable and useful life. I supposed that the principal would be as good as her word—and was more disposed to this belief, when I learned that she was an Abolitionist—a woman of religious principles and integrity—and would be faithful in the performance of her promises, as she had been prompt in making them. In all this I have been grievously—if not shamefully disappointed.

While absent from home on a visit to Cleveland, with a view to advance the cause of education and freedom among my despised fellow countrymen—with whom I am in all respects identified, the September term of the "Seward Seminary" commenced, and my daughter was promptly sent to that school. But instead of receiving her into the school according to agreement—and as in honour the principal was bound to do, she was merely thrust into a room separate from all other scholars, and in this prison-like solitary confinement received the occasional visits of a teacher appointed to instruct her. On my return home, I found her still going to school, and not knowing the character of the treatment extended to her, I asked with a light heart, as I took her to my side, well, my daughter, how do you get on at the Seminary? She answered with tears in her eyes, "*I get along pretty well, but father, Miss Tracy does not allow me to go into the room with the other scholars because I am coloured.*" Stung to the heart's core by this grievous statement, and suppressing my feeling as well as I could, I went immediately to the Seminary to remonstrate with the principal against the cruelty and injustice of treating my child as a criminal on account of her colour—subjecting her to solitary confinement because guilty of a skin not coloured like her own. In answer to all that I could say against such treatment, I was answered by the principal, that since she promised to receive the child into school, she had consulted with the trustees, (a body of persons I believe unknown to the public,) and that they were opposed to the child's admission to the school—that she thought at first of disregarding their opposition, but when she remembered how much they had done for her in sustaining the institution, she did not feel at liberty to do so; but she thought if I allowed her to remain and be taught separately for a term or more, that the prejudice might be overcome, and the child admitted into the school with the other young ladies and misses. At a loss to know what to do for the best interest of the child, I consulted Mrs. Douglass and others, and the result of the consultation was, to take my child from the Seminary, as allowing her to remain under such circumstances, could only serve to degrade her in her own eyes, and those of the other scholars attending the school. Before, however, carrying out my determination to withdraw the child from the Seminary, Miss Tracy, the principal, submitted the question of the child's reception to each scholar individually, and I am sorry to say, in a manner well calculated to rouse their prejudices against her. She told them if there was one objection to receiving her, she should be excluded; and said if any of them felt that she had a prejudice, and that that prejudice needed to be strengthened, that they might have time to whisper among themselves, in order to increase and strengthen that prejudice. To one young lady who voted to receive the child, she said, as if in astonishment; "did you mean to vote so? Are you *accustomed* to black persons?" The young lady stood silent; the question was so extraordinary, and withal so ambiguous, that she knew not what answer to make to it. Despite, however, of the unwomanly conduct of the principal, (who, whatever may be her religious faith, has not yet learned the simplest principle of Christianity—do to others as ye would that others should do unto you)—thanks to the uncorruptible virtue of childhood and youth, in the fullness of their affectionate hearts, they welcomed my child among them, to share with them the blessings and privileges of the school; and when asked where she should sit if admitted, several young ladies shouted "By me, by me, by me." After this manifestation of sentiment on the part of the scholars, one would have supposed that all opposition on the part of the principal would have ceased; but this was not the case. The child's admission was subjected to a severer test. Each scholar was then told by the principal, that the question must be submitted to their parents, and that if one parent objected, the child would not be received into the school. The next morning my child went to school as usual, but returned with her books and other material, saying that one person objected, and that she was therefore excluded from the Seminary.

Now, Sir, these are the whole facts, with one important exception, and that fact is, that you are the person, the only person of all the parents sending young ladies and misses to that Seminary, who was hardened and mean enough to take the responsibility of excluding that child from school. I say, to you exclusively belongs the honour or infamy, of attempting to degrade an innocent child by excluding her from the benefit of attending a respectable school.

If this were a private affair, only affecting myself and family, I should possibly allow it to pass without attracting public attention to it; but such is not the case. It is a deliberate attempt to degrade and injure a large class of persons, whose rights and feelings have been the common sport of yourself and such persons as yourself, for ages, and I think it unwise to allow you to do so with impunity. Thank God, oppressed and plundered as we are, and have been, we are not without help. We have a press, open and free, and have ample means by which we are able to proclaim our wrongs as a people, and your own infamy, and that proclamation shall be as complete as the means in my power can make it. There is a sufficient amount of liberality in the public mind of Rochester to see that justice is done to all parties, and upon that liberality I rely. The young ladies of the school who saw the child, and had the best means of determining whether her presence in the school-room would be offensive or degrading to them, have decided in favour of admitting her, without a dissenting vote. Out of all the parents to whom the question of her admission was submitted, not one, except yourself, objected. You are in a minority of *one*. You may not remain so; there are perhaps, others whom you may corrupt, and make as much like yourself in the blindness of prejudice, as any ordinarily wicked person can be.

But you are still in a minority, and if I mistake not, you will be in a *despised minority*. You have already done serious injury to Seward Seminary. Three young ladies left the school immediately after the exclusion of my daughter, and I have heard of three more, who had intended to go, but who have now declined going to that institution, because it has given its sanction to that anti-democratic, and ungodly caste. I am also glad to inform you that you have not succeeded as you hoped to do, in depriving my child of the means of a decent education, or the privilege of going to an excellent school. She had not been excluded from Seward seminary five hours, before she was gladly welcomed into another quite as respectable, and *equally* Christian to the one from which she was excluded. She now sits in a school among children as pure, and as white as you or yours, and no one is offended. Now I should like to know how much better are you than me, and how much better your children than mine? We are both worms of the dust, and our children are like us. We differ in colour, it is true, (and not much in that respect,) but who is to decide which colour is the most pleasing to God, or most honourable among men? But I do not wish to waste words or argument on one whom I take to be as destitute of honourable feeling, as he has shown himself full of pride and prejudice.

FREDERICK DOUGLASS.

The following address was adopted by the Exeter (England) Anti-Slavery Committee, at a public meeting, on the 11th of August, called to consider the fearful increase of the slave trade to Cuba, and the Brazils. We copy it from the *London Reporter*, as we presume it will be read with interest, especially by our friends, who advocate abstinence from slave labour products as a duty.

ADDRESS OF THE EXETER ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY TO *THEIR FELLOW-CITIZENS.*

The Committee of the Exeter Anti-Slavery Society desire to call the attention of their fellow-citizens to the measures lately announced by Government, for the regulation of the duties upon foreign sugar, and the bearing of those measures upon the Anti-Slavery cause.

They deem it a solemn duty to record their conviction, that the policy represented in the Sugar Duties' Act of 1846, and to the Bill passed this session, respecting the admission of slave-grown sugars to the British market, is utterly at variance with the great principles previously recognized by this nation; and that, if persevered in, it will inevitably tend to perpetuate and increase the horrors of Slavery and the slave trade. In making this declaration, which is sustained by the terrible experience of the last two years, they would have it clearly understood, that they are not influenced by any political considerations. In opposing the present Government measure, they are not identified either with the Protectionist party in Parliament, or with the West India interest. They would scrupulously guard themselves from all party association. In considering this great question, they know nothing of private interests. They take their stand upon the highest ground. They would view the question simply as a *moral* one, and with reference to the universal principles of justice and humanity.

The Bill passed this session provides for the gradual reduction and ultimate abolition of the differential duties between free-grown and slave-grown sugars. It will thus throw open the British market to the planters at Cuba and Brazil—men, who not only uphold an immense slave-system at home, but also maintain an infamous slave trade, which is conducted under circumstances of the most appalling and reckless brutality. The present measure merely carries out the policy commenced in 1846, and is recommended by our leading statesmen as an application of the principles of free trade. Without questioning those principles, the Committee would remind their fellow-citizens, that mere economical considerations, however important, are not the highest, and that the first place should not be assigned to them by a Christian people. A moral question must be decided, before the economical question can be entertained.

If it can be proved, that under the peculiar circumstances of the case, the removal of all differential duties must, of necessity, tend to perpetuate Slavery in Brazil and Cuba, and to aggravate the horrors of the abominable traffic, by means of which the slave markets of those countries are supplied, then it is the imperative duty of a people long distinguished for faithful and unflinchig adherence to Anti-Slavery principles, to resist a change which, however desirable on economical grounds, involves such a fearful amount of moral wrong.

Unhappily, there is abundant proof that our altered policy has already most injuriously affected the interests of humanity; and should the same course be pursued, we shall give a further impulse to Slavery and the slave trade, and thus make our lofty profession of Anti-Slavery principles valueless and vain. It will appear neither more nor less than a terrible mockery.

The Committee would direct attention to the fact, that this has been proved by official returns, and evidence before Committee of Parliament, *that the Sugar Duties. Act of 1846 has given a great stimulus to the trade in slaves* by opening a new market for the sale of the produce of their labour. This result was to be anticipated. So long as their sugars were excluded from this country, the Cuban and Brazilian planters had no urgent need of labourers, and the slave-trade declined. The system which deprived them of Great Britain as a customer could not be a profitable one; and there is much reason for believing that the idea of abandoning Slavery, in order to secure the English market, had been entertained amongst them, previous to the fatal measure of 1846. This enlarged their trade at once, and inspired them with hopes of still greater advantages in future. At the same time the slave-trade revived, and has since increased to a fearful extent. On this fact the Committee rest, in calling for a determined opposition to the Government scheme, or any similar measure. They would not enter into the question, as to whether free-labour can or cannot compete with slave-labour, under favourable circumstances. They point to the significant fact *of a slave-trade now increasing in proportion to the increased facility for the introduction of slave grown produce into the British market.*—With this fact before them, they cannot hesitate to declare that justice and humanity, and a regard for the national honour and consistency, require the English people to return to their original policy, in dealing with slave-trading countries.

As a confirmation of their views, they would direct attention to the following extracts from evidence taken this Session, before a Select Committee of the House of Commons, and just published.—They find it stated by one of the witnesses, that from the year 1840 to 1845 the yearly average of (slave) importations into Cuba and Brazil, was 32, 600. While in 1846, the year of the passing of the Bill, which reduced the duty on slave-grown sugar, the number rose to 64, 233! In 1847, it was increased to 64,967; and this, too, at a time when the

squadron on the coast of Africa, as described by the same witness and others, "was in a state of almost unprecedented activity." So great was the stimulus given, by the reduction of the duties, to the sugar trade of Cuba and Brazil, that in the short space of two years the number of slaves imported into these countries was *almost doubled*, in spite of the utmost vigilance and vigour on the part of the preventive force. And yet, in the face of this fact, the Government now proposed a Bill for a continued reduction, and early abolition of the duties! The immediate and inevitable result of the new measure will be a further increase of the profits of the slave-holder, and the horrors of the slave-trade.

What these horrors are at the present time the following details, gathered from the evidence before alluded to, will sufficiently show. For the sake of brevity, they are brought together in the form of a narrative, and without the introduction of the names of witnesses:—

"The effort of a slave captain is to land as many slaves as he can on the coast of the Brazils; but as it is not possible for the most practised eye to tell a healthy from an unhealthy slave, by seeing him in the barracoons, if the vessel would take 300 slaves, moderately crowded, the captain would take half as many again, say 450, and cram them on board, for the sake of putting them to the test, knowing that all those who were not likely to cross the Atlantic would sicken during the first 48 hours; then, directly they show the symptoms of weakness, they are put on one side of the deck, no food nor water is given them, and they are allowed to die; they are then thrown overboard."

It may be remarked that the practice of over-crowding slave-ships has prevailed to a frightful extent since the introduction of the cruising system. Small vessels of about 130 tons, not much larger than a river barge, have been captured, with nearly five hundred human beings stowed between decks! The slaves, according to the evidence, "are packed into vessels upon their sides; they are *generally* jammed in in such masses, that, even allowing that there was elevation sufficient for them to rise up, they could not do so without the whole section moving together. They are put like books upon a shelf. It is found almost impossible to keep vessels clean. Many, after they come in, are abandoned, from the impossibility of getting any one to clean them; the slaves lie amidst that accumulated filth. Food is conveyed to them, frequently by some half-witted person kept for the purpose. The stench is so excessively offensive that this work is perhaps the greatest punishment to which any one on board can be subjected. The person who performs it has to get on a mass of filth, and almost upon a mass of living bodies at the same time. *Frequently those* that are more remote do not get any food at all."

The Africans are accustomed from the earliest period of life to drink water in very large quantities; they require it. Their sufferings from want of it are much more dreadful than ours would be in like circumstances. It is said, that a boy of ten or twelve years of age would drink more than a gallon a day. On board the slave ships a tin cup-full, once in three days, is said sometimes to have been all that has been given. It has been found that this supports life; but the agony thus occasioned is indescribable. It is ten times more horrible than that which is caused by want of food.

In the case of a death, the body lies amongst the living until an alarm is given, and sometimes until it becomes putrid. When landed, the unhappy slaves are in a state of most awful emaciation and suffering. "The knee-bones appear almost like the head of a person; the muscular part of the arm is gone, it is a mere bone covered with a bit of skin; the abdomen is highly protuberant. There is a complete wasting of the animal system, a mere mass of bones remain. A man takes them up in his arms, and carries them out of the vessel. They frequently require three months' care and feeding before they are fit for the market." The most favourite cargoes at the present time are boys of from eight to twelve years of age. "They *pack* more conveniently."

Such are the present customary atrocities of this thrice-accursed traffic, as reported by the Committee of the House of Commons this session.

In connexion with this subject the Committee would remark, that *the attempt* to suppress the slave-trade by means of a naval force on the coast of Africa has resulted in total failure. It has not diminished the infamous traffic, while it has aggravated the sufferings of the unhappy slave. *It has been proved that this system of* suppression, by leading to the employment of smaller and faster-sailing slave ships, and to other means of evading detection and capture, has fearfully increased the horrors and mortality of the middle passage. Experience teaches us, that so long as there is a brisk demand for slaves, the trade in them will be carried on in spite of all risks, and a commensurate supply be provided.—They would therefore express an earnest hope that a system, not only so profitless, but so prolific of evil, may be speedily abandoned.

At the same time they would direct attention to the position which this country *now* occupies with reference to the Anti-Slavery cause. At the expense of a million a year, and of many valuables lives, we are seeking to suppress the slave trade by force, while at the same moment we give it the most effectual encouragement by opening our ports to slave-grown produce! They have no hesitation in characterising such conduct as a lamentable exhibition either of national folly or national hypocrisy.

Experience has taught us that force cannot suppress the slave-trade, so long as the slave markets are open. Let us close the market, and the trade will, of necessity, cease. This we may hope to do. By sternly and consistently excluding all slave grown sugars from our shores we shall at once decrease the demand for slave-labour, and consequently the horrors of the slave-traffic; and, in all probability, drive the Cuban and Brazilian planters, at last, to abandon a system which has become so detrimental to their interests.

It cannot be too emphatically declared, that the settle-*ment of this great question, in a manner worthy of the* national character, rests with the PEOPLE. The recent debates in Parliament have afforded melancholy proof of the blindness or indifference of our leading statesmen to the moral aspects of the subject. The question has been argued with almost exclusive reference to certain economical principles and commercial interests. It has been treated as a mere pecuniary or party question, whereas it is simply a moral one.

The question for the people of this country is this,—Are they willing after such gigantic efforts and sacrifices in behalf of the Anti-Slavery cause, to sanction a retrograde policy? Will they consent to carry out an economical theory at the expense of the African race? Do they esteem a diminution in the price of sugar, an equivalent for a fearful increase of negro suffering.

This fact should be widely known. The slave-trade is, at this moment, carried on as briskly as ever, and with aggravated cruelty. Week after week, the horrors of the middle passage are renewed. Week after week, hundreds of our African brethren are torn from their country, and hurried, amidst suffering at which the heart sickens, into hopeless captivity. And, be it as widely known, we as a nation are in a great measure responsible for this state of things. By purchasing the sugars of Cuba and Brazil, we directly foster the infernal trade, and make the most effectual provision possible for its permanent prosperity. *So long as we patronize the slave-holding planters of these countries, there is no human probability of the extinction of the traffic.*

One course only is open to us, which is worthy of an Anti-Slavery people. We must retrace our steps. We must demand the repeal of the act of 1846, on the simple ground of humanity and justice to the African. We must say to the Cuban and Brazilian planters, "We will enter into no commercial relations with you; we refuse your produce, so long as you continue to traffic in the souls and bodies of our brethren; we will tax ourselves to any amount, rather than participate in your guilt."—The moral influence which such a declaration would secure to us would be immense, and it is hardly possible that, in the face of our opposition and discouragement, the slave system should long continue profitable.

The committee would advert, in few words, to an objection that has been frequently urged against the course which they recommend. It is said, that it involves an inconsistency; that if we adopt it, we must exclude all slave-grown produce; that American cotton, as well as Brazilian sugar, must come under the ban, and that our testimony will be worthless, if directed against one article of commerce alone. In reply, they frankly admit and deplore the inconsistency. It is their earnest desire that the English nation should manifest more uncompromisingly its abhorrence of Slavery, of every kind and degree. They would rejoice to witness some heroic act of self denial on the part of the people. They would rejoice in behalf of the slave, wherever found, to see the national feeling calling for the discouragement of all slave-grown produce. At the same time, they freely acknowledge that the course which they recommend is beset with difficulties. But if we cannot at once do *all* that we ought, they submit that this is no reason for not doing that which we can. If we are not prepared on the instant to sacrifice our long-standing commerce with the United States, let us not, at least, increase our guilt by countenancing a new traffic which nourishes Slavery, with the addition of the slave-*trade*.

The committee conclude by once more solemnly warning their fellow-citizens against the tendencies of the present policy, and earnestly commend to the people the cause of the injured and defenceless African, which they cannot but regard as having been virtually betrayed by those who direct the legislation of the country.

### CHURCH ACTION ON VOTING.

The Trinitarian Congregational church in North Marshfield, Mass. have taken the *following* ground by a vote of a majority of its members, in reference to their duty as voters. It is rather a novel sphere for church action; but as it respects one of the gravest duties which belong to a man, and one which has an intimate connection with morality and religion, perhaps it is not to be considered as an improper sphere. Without reference to this particular case, it seems to us that little more of the conscientiousness which Christians are want to observe in their purely ecclesiastical transactions, might be profitably carried into their political doings and decisions. The action of the Marshfield church in this:

*Resolved*, That confiding in the help of Almighty God, we will not knowingly employ our right of suffrage, or our influence, at the approaching election, to elevate to any civil office a slaveholder, or any abettor of slaveholding, for any consideration, or in any circumstances whatever.

And, though few and humble, but conscious that every man has influence, and is accountable for its right use, we publish this resolve, wishing to contribute our mite toward the salvation of our beloved country.—*Evangelist.*

From The Campaign of Freedom.

### THE CASE OF THE AMISTAD.

*Historical Statement of the Hon. Henry D. Gilpin, Late United States Attorney General.*

No public man of our day has sustained so much misrepresentation as Mr. Van Buren; and of his many official acts none have been so bitterly or constantly assailed as his course in the celebrated case of the Amistad. This was, too, about the only remaining charge which had not been met and answered to the satisfaction of the vast majority of unprejudiced people.

With feelings of no ordinary gratification, therefore, do we publish the important and valuable historical statement below of the Hon. Henry D. Gilpin, of Philadelphia Mr. Gilpin—who is known to most of our readers as a gentleman of the highest character, had retired from the political scene, and nothing less than the requirements of justice could have brought him at this time before the public.

His letter is long because it could not be otherwise and exhibits all the facts; but every word of it will be read with interest. Lucid, frank and straightforward it bears the unmistakable marks of truth, and furnishes the most triumphant vindication of Mr. Van Buren that his friends could desire.

If nothing else were accomplished by the present canvass than the demolition of the many prejudices which had centred about his name, before they settled down into history—that alone, so far as he is concerned, would be more than a recompense for all the sacrifices he has made, in consenting to be driven from the quiet sanctuary of his declining years, once more into the turmoils of a heated contest.

PHILADELPHIA, 29th September, 1848.

SIR—I reply at once, and with pleasure, to your inquiries in regard to the circumstances which led to the issuing of the warrant of President Van Buren to the Marshal of the State of Connecticut, for the delivery of the negroes of the Amistad to Lieutenant Payne of the United States schooner Grampus; and to those which induced him to decline to direct withdrawal of the appeal, taken to the Supreme Court of the United States, from the decree of the Circuit Court of Connecticut, declaring them to be free.

Though I was not the Attorney General of the United States when the warrant was issued, yet I became so very shortly afterwards; and I was, at the time and subsequently, fully acquainted, as I believe, with the reasons for it. In the proceedings on the appeal to the Supreme Court, I was the legal representative of the United States. In neither of these acts was the conduct of Mr. Van Buren wanting, in the least degree, in humanity towards the negroes or respect for their rights. It was to my opinion, that required by and most consistent with his duty as the Chief Executive Magistrate, bound at once to sustain the complete and impartial administration of the laws to all parties, and the obligations due from the United States to nations with whom they are in peaceful and friendly alliance.

In August 1839, the Spanish schooner Amistad was discovered, by the officers of the United States brig Washington, off the shore of Long Island, with the negroes on board, who had killed the captain and taken possession of her. The vessel, negroes and merchandise on board were carried into New London; libelled in the United States Court for salvage by the officers of the Washington and two other persons, citizens of Long Island; and all taken by the Marshal into his custody. Ruiz and Montes, Spanish citizens, who alleged the negroes to be their slaves, filed a libel in the same court, claiming to have them delivered up as their property. While the negroes were thus in the custody of the law, with these claims in regard to them depending before the court, the Spanish Minister formally demanded of the Government of the United States the delivery of the vessel, merchandise and negroes, as property which they were bound so to deliver up, by the stipulations of their Treaty with Spain; and he also demanded the delivery of the negroes for their transmission to Cuba on the additional ground that they were criminals who had violated the Spanish laws. He declared, officially, that the negroes were slaves, the property of Spanish citizens; and two documents or passports, under the signature of the Governor General of Cuba, were exhibited, certifying the same facts. Mr. Grundy, then the Attorney General of the United States (a statesman and a jurist of whose judgment, learning and patriotism it is needless for me to speak), after full consideration of the whole case, at this stage, expressed, in an official communication, the opinion that, so far as this Government was concerned, the facts, derived from the representations of the Spanish Minister and the official documents, established a right of ownership to the negroes in the persons for whom the Spanish Minister made the demand; and that, under the express stipulations of the Treaty with Spain, the President would be justified in directing the Marshal to deliver them, with the vessel and merchandise, to the order of the Spanish Minister.

This course was not, however, adopted by President Van Buren. A representation having been made to him, on behalf of the negroes, denying that they were slaves under the laws of Spain, or the legal property of the persons for whom the Spanish Minister claimed them, he deemed it his duty to leave the question to the judicial tribunals. Accordingly, the Attorney of the United States in Connecticut filed a suggestion in the Court where the matter was pending between the several parties who claimed an interest in the vessel, cargo, and negroes. In this he stated the application and allegations made to the American Government by the Spanish Minister; and prayed the Court, if it should legally appear that his claim was well founded and conformable to the Treaty, to make such order for the disposal of the vessel, cargo, and slaves, as would best enable the United States, in all respects, to comply with their Treaty stipulations, and preserve the public faith inviolate; or, if it should appear that the negroes had been brought from Africa, and into the United States, in violation of their laws, then to make such order as would enable the United States, in violation of their laws, then to make such order as would enable the United States, if deemed expedient, to send them back to Africa; or, finally, to make such other order in the matter as to the Court might seem fit, right and proper. This suggestion on the part of the United States was presented to the Court on the 19th of September, 1839. To afford time for the parties to obtain the necessary evidence, the 7th of January, 1840, was fixed for the trial.

The Spanish Minister remonstrated against the course thus adopted by the Government of the United States, as not in accordance with the stipulations of the Treaty; contended that it was incumbent on the Executive Government, not the judicial tribunals, to carry them into effect; and repeated his demand for the delivery. He denied, too, that it was a matter in any manner within the jurisdiction of the Court, for, even if the allegations made on behalf of the negroes were true, they proved a violation of the laws of the United States, but of Spain, to be judged of by her tribunals. The Secretary of State, (Mr. Forsyth,) in answering these renewed reclamations, and repeating the determination of the American Government to do justice to the demands of Spain, stated that the proceedings could be conducted only in that manner which the Constitutional institutions of the United States required; and that this was to be done through the medium of the judicial tribunals, because by the organic law of the land, the judiciary was an independent portion of the Government, properly employed in the investigation of the case.

When the period for the decision of the Court was at hand, the circumstances arose which led to the issuing of the *warrant*, one of the particular points of your inquiry. On the 28th December, 1839, Mr. Forsyth, the Secretary of State, in the course of an interview with the Spanish Minister, apprised him that if the Court should adjudge the restitution of the vessel, cargo and negroes, it might be necessary for the Spanish Minister at once to take charge of them. In reply, the Minister addressed him a communication, stating the unseaworthiness of the vessel, and asked that, in the event of the decision of the Court being favourable to the application of the Spanish Government, the use of a public vessel of the United States might be *granted* to convey the negroes and cargo to Cuba, and place them at the disposition of the Governor General of that island.

On the 6th of January, 1840, the Secretary of State, by direction of the President, informed the Spanish Minister that *if the Court should make such a decision*, a vessel of the United States should be held in readiness to receive the negroes and convey them to Cuba, with instructions to the commander to deliver them to the Governor General, "The President," says the Secretary of State, "has the more readily been inclined to accede to your request in this particular, on account of one of the leading motives which prompted you to make it: that the negroes, having asserted before the Court of Connecticut that they are not slaves, may have an opportunity of proving the truth of their allegation before the proper tribunals of the Island of Cuba."

On the following day the *warrant* to the Marshal of Connecticut, directing him to deliver the negroes to Lieut. [illegible] of the schooner Grampus, was signed by the President. It w[illegible] not, however, sent to the Marshal, but was transmitted to Lie[illegible] Lieutenant Payne, who was [illegible] *only on being informed, through the Attorney of the United States, that the delivery of the negroes for the purpose of conveying them to Cuba was adjudged by the Court.* Lieutenant Payne was also directed to advise with the District Attorney as to the mode of *carrying the decision of the Court into effect*, to take with him to Cuba the records, documents, and evidence taken before the Court, so as to inform the public authorities there of all the circumstances of the case; and to deliver to them the negroes and papers, obtaining the advice of the American Consul there, in all his proceedings.

On the 23d of January the decree of the Court was made. It rejected altogether the demand of the Spanish Minister for the delivery of the negroes; declared that they were not slaves by the laws of Spain; and decided that the documents signed by the Governor General of Cuba did not contain a true description of the persons shipped under them. The warrant in question therefore was never used, the circumstances under which it would have been needed, never having arisen.

It seems to me impossible justly to censure the conduct of Mr. Van Buren in any stage of these proceedings. On the contrary, they appear to me throughout to be peculiarly marked by a just regard to official duty; to the rights of all concerned, including the negroes; and to that consideration which is due from the Executive of the United States to a foreign Government, whose appeals to treaty stipulation, even if not thought to be within its provisions, were to be treated with the respect due from one friendly nation to another.

The decree of the Court was not, however, limited to a denial of the right claimed by the Spanish Government under the treaty; or of the allegation of the Spanish Minister, that the negroes were slaves; or of the correctness of the documents signed by the Governor General of Cuba. It went farther, and ordered, not that the negroes should be liberated, but that they should be delivered to the American Executive and sent back to Africa.

You inquire why this decree was not submitted to by the United States? Why did the President refuse the application, stated to have been made to him by the counsel of the negroes, not to prosecute an appeal?

To this it might be sufficient to reply, that in the opinion of the law officers of the United States, the portion of the decree which directed their delivery to the Executive to be sent to Africa, was not, after the evidence disclosed on the trial, warranted by the laws of the United States; and for the reversal of this, if for nothing else, an appeal was absolutely necessary.

But this was not the only nor the chief ground on which an appeal was proper. The Government of the United States had *intervened* at the solemn and reiterated instances of the Spanish Government, demanding the fulfilment of a treaty obligation. It had declined to act, except through the judicial tribunals of the United States. The decision given was that of an inferior tribunal only. That decision was founded on the construction of the treaty between Spain and the United States, at variance with the one placed upon it by the Spanish Government—on a construction of the laws of Spain, relative to slaves, different from that given to them by the Spanish Minister—and on a view of the effect and character of documents, signed by one of the highest public functionaries of Spain, contrary to that placed upon them by the same Minister. Would the Government of the United States have faithfully or fairly fulfilled it promise, to submit the matter to the decision of *the* judiciary, if it had failed to present questions such as these to the Supreme Court? In controversies between the States of this Union, and in cases affecting the Ministers of foreign countries, the Constitution has given to that high Court exclusive jurisdiction; and though it may not have been required by the great charter, yet it is at least in accordance with its spirit, that questions, such as would necessarily be examined on this appeal, and which had arisen directly between our own Government and that of a friendly foreign State, affecting the obligation of a treaty, the construction of foreign laws, and the weight and validity of the highest foreign functionaries, should, in their ultimate adjustment, receive the decision of that paramount Constitutional arbiter.

Another consideration of just weight with the President, was the fact, that the right of the United States to carry the subject by an appeal to the Superior court had been directly affirmed, after solemn argument. Having, therefore, the legal right to receive the judgment of the highest court, and being required to perform an executive act towards a foreign nation on the basis of a judicial decree, the President of the United States was not only justified, but acted merely within the limits of obligation and duty, in seeking for and acting upon the final decision of the Supreme Court of the United States.

It was mainly on these considerations—though not exclusively, for there were others, though of less weight, directly arising from some portions of the decree of the Court in Connecticut, deemed to be erroneous—that my own opinion, as the law officer of the Government, was given, without hesitation, to Mr. Van Buren, advising that the appeal should be prosecuted and the final decision of the Supreme Court of the United States obtained, as the basis of executive action. On a review of the subject, (after this long interval,) to which I have been led by your inquiry, I can see no ground to change the opinion I then expressed.

I have replied to your inquiries thus, in considerable detail, because, in my opinion, no acts of Mr. Van Buren's administration are more free from every just ground of censure than his proceedings in regard to the Amistad. In every stage of them I was myself the witness of his constant determination to fulfil his executive duty with an equal and just regard to his obligation to our own laws, to his position as the representative of the nation in official intercourse with Spain, and to every dictate which humanity suggested or justice imposed towards the negroes whose rights and liberty were involved. In a legal controversy—such as this was—the ardour and the bias of the advocate seldom enable him to pass a judgment, entirely impartial or correct, on the conduct of one who refuses to assent to his views; and, in times of political contest, that construction is apt to be given to the actions and motives of public men which most coincides with the opinions entertained of their general public character and conduct. From the effect of neither of these circumstances can Mr. Van Buren expect to be exempted, in the judgment that may have been or shall be passed upon him, in regard to this transaction; but as the facts connected with it are matters of public record, they will not fail to secure for him, in the end, that just and impartial judgment from his country, which must be the object most sincerely coveted, by one whose life and actions, public and private, have been governed by purposes always patriotic, and by motives eminently just, benevolent, elevated and pure.

I am, Sir, very respectfully yours,
HENRY D. GILPIN.

GEORGE H. PURSER, Esq. New York.

### THE SUGAR QUESTION.

Douglass Jerrold's Newspaper, (London) in summing up the action of the late Parliament, thus states the final result of the agitation on the Sugar Question:

The next important measure related to the West India colonies. The object of the Whig act of 1846 was gradually to abolish all differential duties on sugar, so that the slave-grown and free-grown produce should be admitted into our markets on equal rates of duty. This scheme gave great offence to the colonists. A committee of the House of Commons was appointed to collect evidence and frame a report, and that committee recommended a differential duty of ten shillings in favour of the West Indies. Government resisted the proposition, and introduced a new sliding scale, the result of which will be that next year the colonists will have a protection against the slave-owners of seven shillings in the article of clayed, and of five and-sixpence in that of Muscovado sugar—to taper away gradually, until, in 1854, the protective duty will be reduced to three shillings on the one article, and to two shillings on the other. This new sliding scale is to be accompanied by a *loan* of £500,000 in addition to £160,000 already guaranteed during this session.

The question is beset with difficulties. There is no doubt that as a matter of pounds, shillings, and pence, we have lost in the cost of sugar more than we have gained by our exports to the West Indies. We are bound to consider the interests of consumers as well as those of producers, and under these views the differential duties ought to be abolished. But other considerations arise. When we purchased the emancipation of the negroes, and put an end to the apprenticeship system, a distinct pledge was given to the West Indian proprietors that slave-grown sugar should be excluded from our markets, on the faith of which pledge large investments were made in buildings and machinery, especially in the Mauritius. It is urged that as those investments would not have been made unless on the Parliamentary pledge, and as they *will* become valueless if slave-grown sugar is admitted, the West Indies have a special claim to protection based on a special contract; nor can it be denied that equity is so far in their favour. Moreover, we maintain a blockading squadron on the coast of Africa at an annual cost of £1,300,000 for the express purpose of putting down the Slave Trade, and we encourage that Trade by opening our markets to the produce of Cuba and Brazil.—This is gross inconsistency. If *it* be argued that we should altogether abandon the West Indies, and release them from allegiance, because they cost us in money more than we receive from them in money, that argument would justify as in recognizing Ireland as an independent State, since the total nett revenue of Ireland is barely more than sufficient to provide the interest of that portion of the National Debt which is assigned to Ireland. But these are narrow and false views. The strength of England lies in its dominion of the seas, and a maritime power must be a colonial power. We prize at its full value our manufacturing position, but the stability and grandeur of the empire does not depend on a facility of fabricating linens, woolens, and calicoes. Our business is, by improved methods of administration, to reconcile the interests of our colonies with the interests of our domestic marts of industry, and this is to be effected by appointing Secretaries of State who have a local and personal knowledge of our transmarine dominions, instead of conferring the office on men who have no other recommendation than the accident of birth or parliamentary influence transmitted through an ancestor.

The West Indian debates revealed this financial curiosity. Lord JOHN RUSSELL defended his policy on the ground that we had obtained cheap sugar, but when he proposed a *loan* to the West Indies, amounting on the whole to £660,000, he impliedly confessed that the cheapness was nominal and illusory, since it had ruined those who had supplied the article. We are glad to give back with one hand what we received with the other, for the repayment of a *loan* to beggared borrowers is a hopeless reversion. The encouragement of slave produce will render the liquidation of the debt impossible. Neither must we omit here to notice the very extraordinary defence of the ministerial measures by Sir ROBERT PEEL, who offered, as a consolation to the West India proprietors, the speedy prospect of a negro insurrection in Cuba and Brazil, by which the competition of slave-grown produce against free-grown produce would cease.

# The Anti-Slavery Standard.

Without Concealment—Without Compromise.

NEW-YORK OCTOBER 12, 1848.

### "The Conquerors of the New World and their Bondsmen."

This is the title of a historical work, the first volume of which has just been published in London. It is the beginning of an intended complete history of Slavery, and, though the author has brought his narrative down only as far as the year 1512, is interesting as showing the small seed from which this deadly Upas-tree has sprung. Thinking that our readers will be interested in following the author in his course, we shall note the chief matters which have struck us in reading the book, preserving the order of chronology.

The first slaves brought from Africa in modern times were ten negroes, whom, in the year 1442, Antonio Gonçalvez obtained in exchange for two Moors. These Moors, who were always looked upon as legitimate plunder, had been seized by Gonçalvez upon the coast of Africa, he having been sent out by Prince Henry of Portugal on a voyage of discovery. Soon after (1474), we find that a trade in negro slaves had grown up. African slaves had by this time, we are told, become very numerous in Seville. These "were treated very kindly, * * * * * * being allowed to keep their dances and festivals, and one of them was named *mayoral* of the rest, *who protected them against their masters and before the courts of law*, and also settled their private quarrels." Under date 1474 is a letter from Ferdinand and Isabella "to a celebrated negro, Juan de Valladolid, commonly called the Negro Count," nominating him to this office. Among other passages in this letter is the following, "because we know your sufficiency, ability, and good disposition, we constitute you *mayoral* and judge, &c." It is tolerably evident that Ferdinand and Isabella had but a limited knowledge of those nicer proprieties which regulate the conduct of republicans toward persons of a different complexion. Moreover it would appear that the inherent incapacity-for-self-protection theory had not yet been broached, for we find here a black man not only allowed to take care of himself, but appointed to the charge of others. We would not deal too hardly with their Catholic majesties for their shortcomings in these particulars, it being above three hundred years since they have been dead, and, perhaps, (if interfering with the designs of Providence in the case of Ham be anything), something worse.

All along during these first years of the slave trade, the ostensible chief motive of the persons in power who encouraged it was the eternal salvation of the Africans. And we can easily believe them to be sincere without supposing any very prodigious amount of benevolence on their part. The truth is, that in most cases, probably, their charity began at home and tarried there. These good people believed (and that was an age when people believed what they did believe with considerable thoroughness) that they were thus making large deposits to stand in their names on the creditor side of the ledger of the Bank of Heaven, to be drawn on as happened to be convenient. If funds of this sort could be accumulated by sprinkling a score or two of Africans with holy water, and converting them from a mumbo-jumbo which they understood, to one they did not understand it was excellent pay considering the amount of work. Perhaps, as the importation of Africans increased, the ceremonial of sprinkling was performed wholesale on large numbers at once, by means of some kind of engine for the purpose, an economical proceeding somewhat similar to which we remember to have heard of in Georgia some two years ago. There is no doubt that this pious wish of getting Africans baptised entered largely into the plans of those who encouraged the slave trade. The same argument (without the same faith) is urged upon us now by some persons of tender (or, at leat, soft and pliable) consciences. It is truly refreshing to meet with a piece of stupidity whose origin we can distinctly trace, and which we thereby find to be only a little above three hundred years old. Generally we can follow them back as far as we have any historical record or even any legend, everywhere ready to get in the way of every new *reformer and projector*. We are thankful to find a comparatively young one, and to be able to realise that there were many long ages unvexed by it.

A contemporary Chronicler, who was an eye-witness of the partition of some cargoes of slaves brought to Portugal in 1444, has left upon record a very simple and affecting narrative of it. We copy a few passages. The writer, Azurara, begins by praying God to forgive his tears, inasmuch as his human nature would get the better of his conscientious satisfaction at the eternal gain which was to repay those poor creatures for such bitter suffering. "But what heart was that, how hard soever, which was not pierced with sorrow, seeing that company. For some had sunken cheeks, and their faces bathed in tears, looking at each other. Others were groaning very dolorously, looking at the heights of the heavens, fixing their eyes upon them, crying out loudly, as if they were asking succor from the father of nature. Others struck their faces with their hands, throwing themselves on the earth. Others *made their lamentation in songs, according to the customs of their country*, which, although we could not understand their language, we saw corresponded well to the height of their sorrow. But now, for the increase of their grief, came those who had the charge of the distribution, and began to put them apart one from the other in order to equalize the portions. Wherefore it was necessary to part children and parents, husbands and wives and brethren from each other. Neither, in the partition of friends and relations, was any law kept, only each fell where the lot took him. * * * * * Who will be able to make this partition without great difficulty? For, while they are placing in one part the children, that saw their parents in another, they sprang up perseveringly and fled to them. The mothers enclosed their children in their arms, and threw themselves with them on the ground, receiving wounds with little pity for their own flesh, so that their children might not be torn from them." The good Azurara, who clearly has something more than a mere apparatus of *systole* and *diastole* in his bosom, saw deeper into this matter of *the songs* than most modern observers. Now does he fail to notice that the sufferings of these limbs, thrown, as it were, over the walls into the fold, found sympathy in the unadulterated human instincts of the Portuguese crowd who witnessed them.

That picture was painted four hundred and four years ago! The simple chronicler had some art to make his colours stand wonderfully fresh and vivid. It was because he used a ground of simple human feeling, we fancy. But think of it, for now nearly *half a thousand years* have these things been going on, only growing more and more cruel. Here is a picture which we should like to see hung in the parlour of the pious and kind-hearted slaveholder, who makes it a principle not to part families, that he might see what would take place if it were to be said to him "this night thy soul shall be required of thee." We suspect that Azurara would hardly have voted for General Taylor.

In the accounts of the early voyages to the African coast, we have some scattered notices of the natives, which show that they were vastly better off then, than after four hundred years of intercourse with white men and Christians. The first voyager who left a written diary of what he did and saw, was Ca da Mosto, whose expedition was make in 1454. He says of the people on the South side of the Senegal River, that "they are exceeding black, tall, corpulent, and well made. * * Both men and women wash themselves four or five times a day, being very cleanly as to their persons, but not so in eating; in which they observe no rule.—Although very ignorant and awkward in going about anything which they have not been accustomed to, yet in their own business, which they are acquainted with, they are as expert as any Europeans can be. They are full of words, and never have done talking, and are, for the most part, liars and cheats. Yet, on the other hand, they are very charitable, for they give a dinner, or a night's lodging, and a supper to all strangers who come to their houses, without expecting any return. * * * They are extremely bold and fierce, choosing rather to be killed than to save their lives by flight. They are not afraid to die, nor scared, as other people are, when they see a companion slain."

The discovery that in these people was the connecting link between man and the baboon, was reserved for later times and more scientific observers. Ca da Mosto finds them well-made, cleanly, and hospitable, great liars. (we imagine that *he* was not very explicit in unfolding his violent baptismal designs in regard to them) brave and contemptuous of death. No hint as yet of any peculiar *odour* by which they were distinguished. This particular mark of inferiority is discernible only to persons of very refined sensibilities, and to vulgar ruffians reeking of rum and tobacco. Perhaps some information on the subject might be obtained from certain four-legged canine fellow-soldiers of the modern Cincinnatus. It is curious, by the way, that this olfactory stigma has been affixed to other oppressed races. It was formerly one of the apologies for maltreating the Jews. Sir Thomas Brown considers it with becoming gravity in his vulgar errors, and concludes that "if we concede a notional unsavouriness in any people, yet shall we find the Jews less subject hereto than any."

Ca da Mosto sailed down the coast eight hundred miles to the southward of the Senegal, and visited the country of a negro King, Budomel, who received him courteously. This Budomel seems to have been not altogether without some prudent and statesmanlike reflections on matters of religion, for he informed da Mosto "that he looked upon the religion of the Europeans to be good, for that none but God could have given them so much riches and understanding." He seems also to have had some glimpses of the doctrine of compensation, declaring "that he believed the negroes were more sure of salvation than the Christians, because God was a just Lord, and, therefore, as he had given the latter paradise in this world, it ought to be possessed in the world to come by the negroes, who had scarce anything here in comparison of the others." It is gratifying to us as palefaces to think, that, however much of truth there might have been in these royal speculations at that time, the two races have been put more upon a footing of equality by the advantages of religious instruction which the coloured people have had afforded them.

It appears that, as early as 1484, facilities were afforded for Christianizing Africa without so costly an expedient as a Colonization Society, or so cruel a one as carrying the natives thousands of miles to make slaves of them. In that year Congo was discovered by Diego Cam, who, at the request of the king of that country, took back with him to Portugal some of the sons of the principal men to be baptized and instructed in the Christian faith. In the same year the king of Benin sent ambassadors to the king of Portugal requesting that priests might be sent to him.

About the same time also, a negro Prince, named Bemoin, came to Portugal to seek assistance against a usurper by whom he had been ousted from his throne. The description of him is interesting. Nothing about natural inferiority thus far. "Bemoin, because he was a man of large size and fine presence, about forty years old, with a long and well-arranged beard, appeared, indeed, not like a barbarous pagan, but as one of our own princes, to whom all honour and reverence were due. With like majesty and gravity of demeanour, he commenced and finished his oration. * * * * And, taking leave of the king, he went to kiss the queen's hand, and then that of the prince, to whom he said a few words, at the end of which, he prayed the prince that he would intercede in his favour with the king. And thence he was accompanied to his lodgings by all the nobility that accompanied him." The attendants of Bemoin are spoken of by the same historian as "gentlemen."

We shall continue our extracts in some future paper, and follow the progress of *Christianization* to the West Indies. We shall there find the system of Slavery becoming gradually more and more firmly and openly established, accompanied always with the most disastrous results both to the enslaver and his victim, demoralizing the one and destroying the other. For it is only in entering the service of the Devil that men are willing to pay a high price for the "situation."

The Whig party of Massachusetts is evidently *in extremis*. The stump speeches of its ablest men, the proverbial veracity of its principle organ, the *Atlas*, the impertinent smartnesses of "Peeping Tom," of the *Courier*, and even the probability that the *Advertiser* will wake itself up before December to the fact that a Presidential campaign is going on, have proved vain to save it. As a last resort it has called out the Hon. Harrison Gray Otis, of Boston, from his gouty retirement in Beacon street, to administer to it such ghostly comfort as the hoarded wisdom of nearly eighty years can give. If the voice, as it were, from the grave, of one who once led the party that was animated by the stern virtue of the best days of the Republic cannot save it, it will, it is to be hoped, put itself in a proper frame of mind to receive the final ordinance of extreme unction, and make as decent a death as so ill-spent a life can have.

It is a melancholy sight to see the tranquillity of the evening of life disturbed by the passions which age should have tempered, whatever palliation there may have been for them in the hot blood and heyday of youth. But it is still more sad when an old man, tottering on the brink of the grave, gathers his remaining strength to mingle once more in the strife of men, for a bad purpose, and one which cannot be extenuated by the plea that youthful zeal had so warped the judgment that length of days had only served to strengthen the evil bias. Had Mr. Otis, forty years ago, been a Jacobin; had he belonged to the party which was always ready to sacrifice the interests of the North at the bidding, and in behalf of the slave-power; had he been an advocate of the war which ruined the commerce of New England, and which Mr. Rhett in his recent speech at Charleston said was a war for South Carolina; had he defended Jefferson in the purchase of Louisiana that the domestic slave-trade might find a new market, and the political power of the South be increased; had he opposed the Hartford Convention, which notwithstanding his assertion, we believe, had a higher purpose than to compel a more equitable division of the loaves and fishes of office; had he been found on the side of the slaveholding interest when Missouri demanded admission into the Union; we should not have wondered that at fourscore years he should have written, as he has, a letter to his fellow-citizens advocating the election of General Taylor, thereby aiding and abetting the policy which he has spent the best years of his life in combatting.

But what Mr. Otis has been, few know or care now, even in Massachusetts. What he is, they will judge from the letter which he has just addressed to the people of that State. That he came forward a dozen years ago, after a long retirement from all participation in public affairs, to lead the hounds of *pro-Slavery* in a hunt which ended in mobbing thirty women who had assembled to pray for the slave,—in an attempt to compass the death, by mob-law, of a peaceful citizen of Boston,—and in driving from that city a gentleman who is now the honoured representative in the British Parliament of one of the largest and most intelligent constituencies in the Kingdom—even all this might have been forgotten, and Harrison Gray Otis remembered only as a leading Federalist in the days when to be a public man was an honour, had he not himself taken the trouble to bring these facts before his countrymen, at a time when he is certain of a large and attentive audience, who will not readily pardon, nor easily forget those who have prostituted talent, and character, and the influence of position to check the growth of that awakened patriotic fervour which aims at truly extending "the blessing of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, and at fixing a limit to the slave-mongering policy of the Republic. It has been esteemed a singular fact that so many of the great men who achieved our national independence have left no lineal representatives of their name behind them. The time will come when it will be remembered with satisfaction by those who cherish the memory of the fathers, that he who has thus tarnished the name he bears was a collateral descendant only from that Otis who did more perhaps than any other one man to excite in his countrymen the spirit of resistance to tyranny, and who fell a martyr to the principles he loved.

Mr. Otis's letter, whatever harm it may do himself, will be of little service to the cause of General Taylor. So far as that is concerned, it will be esteemed only as a desperate though weak remedy for a desperate cause.—The lesson which he learned from Fisher Ames, and repeats so correctly without apparently at all apprehending its meaning, of the danger which threatens our liberties from the spirit of faction, and which within a few years has been, in so great a measure, realized, will be read and pondered, and the application made to the party which, by promised bribes of money and office, has compassed the nomination for the highest office in the Government, of a man who has no other claim than that of success in an inglorious and unjust war, waged for a worse purpose than was ever conceived of by the worst of tyrants.

Nor will a less rigorous application be made of other passages to the writer himself. Curious people will ask if the sneers, not simply at the fanaticism of Anti-Slavery, but at the now so prevalent, and certainly not unreasonable fears—Daniel Webster being witness—of the extension of Slavery, are not the growth of a closer connection with the system itself than is getting to be altogether reputable among the good people of New England. Mr. Otis is not, that we know of, a slaveholder, but some members of his family, unless report belies them, are.—That he should not be sensitive to any dangers from the increase of Slavery is not singular. Neither will the tone of satisfaction with which he says that the question of the propriety of giving office to slaveholders was settled sixty years ago, excite surprise, though it may arouse suspicions of the purity of his own patriotism when he leads his readers to infer that it was not the infringement upon the rights of the Northern people by the slave power which led the leading men of New England to meet in Convention at Hartford, but chagrin that their more cunning opponents of the South left them too small a portion of the spoils of office, that moved them thus to jeopard the peace of the country.

One paragraph of the letter we quote entire. It is the only one we fancy that will not be forgotten in a month, and for it we bespeak a place in the history of the Anti-Slavery cause. It should be remembered that not only Harrison Gray Otis, who, for half a century was a leading public man of Massachusetts, who has filled various offices of trust and honour, and among them that of a Senator in the National Legislature, but that an ex-Mayor of Boston thus relates how ready he was to use his official power to crush the freedom of the press, and persecute free speech, at the bidding of two petty despots a thousand or fifteen hundred miles away, who choose to extend to Massachusetts the laws of their own plantations, hoping—not without reason, as the sequel proved—to find ready overseers in the Municipal authorities of the city of Boston

The rise and progress of this fever is curious. The first information received by me of a disposition to agitate this subject in our State, was from the Governors of Virginia and Georgia, severally remonstrating against an incendiary newspaper, published in Boston, and as they alleged, thrown broad-cast among their plantations, inciting to insurrection and its horrid results. It appeared on inquiry that no member of the city government, nor any person of my acquaintance had ever heard of the publication. Some time afterward, it was reported to me by the city officers that they had ferreted out the paper and its editor; that his office was an obscure hole, his only visible auxiliary a negro boy, and his supporters a few very insignificant persons of all colours. This information, with the consent of the aldermen, I communicated to the above named Governors, with an assurance of my belief that the new fanaticism had not made, nor was likely to make proselytes among the respectable classes of our people. In this, however, I was mistaken. It shortly afterwards appeared that the infection had spread beyond the obscure locality in which it seemed to have originated. An abolition party was organized, a public meeting of the citizens of Boston was called by the agitators, at which, however, no countenance was given to their views, which were then denounced as political in their tendency and object, though this was denied. *From* that time the party has gathered strength and numbers. Thus, from a source so inconsiderable and obscure, has arisen an agitation of the public mind, of which the tendency is to desecrate the memory of departed heroes and statesmen, who struggled side by side with our ancestors for their common liberties, and to bring upon the planters of the South the hatred and contempt of their Northern brethren, and indeed, as their infatuated leaders openly avow, to dissolve the Union!

It is a somewhat notable fact, that these infatuated leaders, still unhanged and even unawed by mobs of property and standing, have continued to promulgate the truths first avowed by the young printer—with his auxiliary negro boy—in that obscure hole out of which he was ferreted by the Honourable Mr. Otis, or his official coadjutors, at the bidding of two of the Governors of the Sovereign States of the Union; and that one so well read in the history of Revolutions, as the writer of this letter must be, should not have learned that arguments stronger than sneers, and more rational than assumed contempt are needed to arrest the progress of a movement, to the already stupendous results of which he himself is a witness.

### South Carolina Politics.

The aspect of political affairs in the smart little State of South Carolina, which never admits the idea that there is a greater nation on the face of the globe than herself, is always interesting. It is amusing to see how entirely confident she is of her own wisdom, and her own importance, and interesting to learn through her, the ultra views and extravagant pretensions of the slaveholders. The South Carolina politicians are always bold, and never hesitate to avow before the world the principles by which the South, in the main, is governed, and the policy which in the end is continuously but certainly adopted. She acts as the pilot-fish to the shark; seeks out, and leads the way to the prey which her slower and greedy follower devours. The boldness of her pretensions excite the ridicule of the North, at the same time that they lull her into fancied security, by their very extravagance; while the South guided by the key-note which Calhoun and his friends give, is sure to gain not all that they have demanded but all that they need and expect to get. Should the South ever dissolve the Union,—South Carolina will be at the head of the movement, as she has always been the first and the loudest in using the ever-ready, and hitherto ever-successful, threat to do so, when the North has hesitated for a moment to yield up her own rights and interests at Southern dictation. So far it has only been necessary to threaten, and no doubt in many cases nothing more than a threat was intended, which would never have been executed had the North had the courage to accept the alternative. But it is by no means certain that she is not ready to stand to her word, and form a Southern confederacy when the right time comes, that is when her peculiar institution is seriously menaced. The Union may be dissolved sooner than any of us dare hope. Nobody will deny that the extension of Slavery is a vital question with the South. She will not

forego it without a desperate struggle, and if defeated she will not silently acquiesce in the overthrow of hopes and plans cherished for years, and to realize which she purchased Louisiana, annexed Texas, and conquered Mexico. Louisiana and Texas, it is true, she has made an open market for human flesh, but the supply yielded by the viginial crop is greater than the demand, and New Mexico and California are needed as an asylum for the younger sons, and their "niggers," of the overstocked plantations of Virginia and the Carolinas, as well as to increase the influence and the weight of the slave power at Washington. The latent Anti Slavery of the South without doubt will arouse itself in the event of a serious Southern movement for Disunion, but the slaveholders have the *prestige* of past domination in their favour, and would not be foiled in this. And if they should, the other alternative for which Northern Abolitionists are labouring—the Abolition of Slavery—would be secured, for in such a contest at the South there would be no half-way measures. For as with us it is Abolition or Disunion, with them it would be, Disunion and Slavery, or Union and Emancipation.

The leading politicians of South Carolina are already mustering their forces, and advocating a Dissolution of the Union in case the extension of Slavery into the New Territory should be forbidden by Congress. On this point they are agreed, however much they may differ in regard to the Presidential question. Mr. H. B. Rhett made a speech a few days since at Charleston, in which he said:

Now you have this great question of Slavery upon you; and my counsel is, as of yore—meet the question at once, and forever. Have no more talk in Congress by your Representatives; but bring your power to bear directly on the question—not through a Southern Convention, which you cannot get, (and which, if you get, may only breed confusion and weakness in the South,) but by the States—the parties to the Constitutional compact, and its legitimate guardians by the theory of the Constitution itself. *Let the Southern States instruct their Senators, and request the Representatives, to leave their seats in Congress immediately and return home, should abolition, in any of its forms, prevail in the legislation of Congress—whether in our territories, the District of Columbia, or between the States.* Let the South take this position—let but five States in the South take this position—let but two States, Virginia and South Carolina, take this position and maintain it, and the South is safe. If driven to action by the aggressions of the North in Congress, all other steps which the honour and interests of the South shall demand will be easily assumed. But if the South still sleeps inactive, submissive to aggressions—if no other State will maintain her dignity and her rights under the Constitution on this great question, let South Carolina unaided and alone, meet the contest. She can force every State in the Union to take sides, for or against her. She can compel the alternative—*that the rights of the South be respected*, or *the Union be dissolved*. This, in my humble opinion, is the only course by which the Union can be preserved, or be worth preserving; and let the result be what it may, we will at least have the consolation of having made one brave, long, strong effort, to save ourselves from foul, ignominious, and dishonourable ruin.

The object of this speech, of which the above paragraph is the conclusion, was made to further the election of Cass and Butler. Mr. Rhett thinks that if General Taylor should be elected, and should veto a bill for the prohibition of Slavery, that his election would have been a "sheer fraud," inasmuch as he has not expressly stated what his course would be on that subject, and has permitted his Northern friends to represent him as not opposed to the Wilmot Proviso. That Taylor's election will be a stupendous fraud upon all Northern flats there can be no doubt, but nobody else believes the lying assertions of the reckless and unprincipled politicians of the Whig party. Mr. Rhett also aims to show—Heaven save the mark!—that Millard Fillmore is an Abolitionist. Should Taylor be elected, and should he oppose the further extension of Slavery, he would carry a Southern party with him; and therefore, Mr. Rhett thinks, it is of the last importance that he should be defeated. As to Mr. Cass, though Mr. Rhett esteems him as perfectly reliable, it is, he says of very little consequence what course he may take, as he is a Northern man, and the South, in the question of Slavery, would rally against him. "Such," may exclaim Mr. Cass, "is the gratitude of republics!"

We make from Mr. Rhett's speech one other extract, in which he gives his views of the critical state of affairs at this moment, and of the peaceful and tame disposition which has hitherto been displayed by the friends of Southern institutions. Considering that the South has never hesitated to ask for anything she wanted, and never failed in getting it, we think Mr. Rhett is hardly just. Mr. Rathbun may jeer the South that she has not yet dissolved the Union, as she has so often threatened, but he forgot—and Mr. Rhett seems to have forgotten—that the North has never yet given her the chance:

I have, gentlemen, endeavoured, in obedience to your call, to assign a few of the prominent reasons which should induce you to support General Cass and General Butler, rather than General Taylor and Mr. Fillmore, in the approaching Presidential election. But I wish you not to understand that I put any reliance on Presidential elections to protect the South. The South must protect itself. In the present condition of the world, no slaveholding communities can be safe but by their own energies. That we are surrounded by dangers in the Union, no man who is conversant with the common facts of the day can doubt. Contrary to the whole spirit of the constitution, Congress has become, but little else than a great centre for abolition agitation. The great absorbing question now in the politics of the Union is the institution of Slavery. Associations are made and parties arise in the North looking solely to its overthrow. The constitution is nullified in the free States so far as the recovery of fugitive slaves is concerned, and step by step aggression after aggression will be pursued in Congress. There is but one way under heaven of stopping their aggressions, and securing your peace and safety. You must act, and act decisively. Surely the policy of doing nothing but talking and threatening must, by this time have disclosed its vanity. You have talked and threatened until you are despised. It is not one Abolitionists alone who thinks that you cannot "be kicked out of the Union," and that therefore all experiment, by the free States, on your rights and institutions, can be made with impunity. This is the common sentiment of the North. They believe that you cannot and dare not protect yourselves. Mr. Rathbun, from the State of New York, said on the floor of Congress: "You threatened to resist the repeal of the tariff of 1833, yet you submitted. You declared that you would not tolerate the repeal of the 21st rule; yet you submitted. There is no danger to the Union. You will submit and submit to anything we shall do!" This was the substance of his language; and it is the language and opinion of the great mass of the Northern people. What you want is not power—that you have in far greater proportion than your ancestry when they faced and vanquished Great Britain in the revolution—but what you want is respectability. You are despised. If the North was satisfied that any one measure of abolition, if enforced, would immediately be equivalent to a dissolution of the Union, that measure would require no resistance from you to defeat it. You need not talk, much less deal in threats. The fact would be all powerful and all sufficient for your protection. No agitation, need be with you concerning your institutions. The fact that it exists at all in the South under the constitution of the United States, is proof conclusive of your imbecility, and proof also that the constitution has failed in affording to you that "domestic tranquillity," which on its face it was established to secure. If you remain inactive, and allow things to take their course much longer, you will be compelled to choose between the alternatives of a dissolution of the Union, or your own salvation. They are not now incompatible; and to save both, has been the great object of my efforts in the twenty years of my public life. My friend, who now sits near me on the platform, knows that, in 1828, I declared to the people of Colleton district, at a dinner given to their then Representative in Congress, that the general government must be driven back to its legitimate limitations in the constitution. That if we yielded on the taxing power, the next stride would be against our slave institutions; and that I was for fighting on the tariff the battle which must otherwise be fought on Slavery. I said the same thing in 1844, after witnessing in Congress my anticipations but too truly realized.

At the same time with the publication of Mr. Rhett's Anti-Taylor Speech, a letter appears from General Hamilton, a native, and for a long time an influential citizen of South Carolina, though now residing in Georgia, in which he seems to express his satisfaction with the chance of either Cass or Taylor, as both are safe for the South. He nevertheless entertains strong fears as to how the present crisis in National affairs may terminate, and thus calls upon his countrymen of South Carolina to be in readiness to meet the emergency:

The upshot of all the discussions which have taken place on the Mexican War, and the Wilmot proviso, is that the South is not even to have the Missouri compromise, which was a concession, and an enormous concession, she generously made both to union and peace. This must bring up a solemn issue: whether we are willing to have a brand put upon our foreheads, and to admit at once that we are a degraded a morally degraded people, essentially colonial in all the characteristics of our ignominious submission.

For this crisis let South Carolina be united and in position. By a moral destiny, which she cannot resist, the intelligence and bravery of her people will throw her at the head of the column in advance. What her glorious sons did at Contreras, Churubusco, Chapultepec, and the Garita, are a mere prelude and foreshadowing of what they will do in defence of their rights, under the Constitution of the United States, on any battle field upon which God pours either the light of day or shrouds in the darkness of night.

You and myself, my dear sir, belonged to a party in our State, accused, unjustly accused, of disaffection to the Union. Fifteen years have elapsed since our contest occurred on the great question of free trade with the general government. I certainly had my full share of responsibility in those events, to which you refer in terms of so much kindness and compliment. I assure you that if I concurred in the compromise, by which those difficulties were composed, and for which the country owes so large a debt of gratitude to Mr. Clay and Mr. Calhoun, I am no less anxious now, that spirits equally gifted and blessed may arise, who may have the power to stay the coming storm, and give to the country once more the "rainbow of peace and hope." But it is in vain to conceal the fact that the Union is disquieted by evils as portentous in their magnitude as they seem to be incurable in their acrimony. I trust that these are but gloomy forebodings, that have no real existence except in over excited anxieties. I wish that I could participate in the confidence of others; but when such a man as Daniel Webster, with his large intellect, his cordially avowed attachment to the Union, essentially a man of peace, intimated on the last day of the last session of Congress, and distinctly intimated, that the free States would not give ground even at the hazard of (in his opinion) the last and greatest calamity which can befal our country, is it not high time for us to ask whether we will give ground? We who are not the aggressive but the aggrieved party—who are entitled to all the common benefits, rights and privileges of this session—we who could only surrender them with a baseness and cowardice which would set us up as a mark in the future history of the world, for its eternal contumely and scorn; and this too to be submitted to by a people as essentially military in their instincts as any that God has ever created; with all the aptitudes for war; who find a safe seat on the back of the wildest horse of the prairie; in whose hands the deadly rifle never commits one error or mistake.

We nevertheless mistrust these fire-eating Centaurs who *did not* "go to the death" for this same General Hamilton's sugar in '33. If they threaten to dissolve the Union this time, we hope they will not be frightened out of it by a revenue-cutter or two in Charleston harbour.

As all lovers of their country are supposed to feel some interest in the qualifications and ability of those who are, or who are likely to be, the choice of the people to fill the highest office in their gift, we copy the following precious specimen of elegant and chaste English which is just now circulating through the papers. If anybody doubts, after reading it, that the prospective Whig President is a fit head of a great and intellectual people, he must be worse than an Infidel. The letter, it is supposed, was written to somebody thanking him for a horse, and the reader will probably conclude when he has read to the end of the letter, that the conjecture may perhaps be correct:

HEADQUARTERS, ARMY OF OCCUPATION,
Corpus Christi, Texas, Jan. 15, 1846.

MY DEAR MAJOR:—Your highly esteemed letter of the 28th of November last, accompanied by one from Colonel Wynn, of Lafayette county, Arkansas, to you, of the 24th of the same month, has just reached me.—While I feel much flattered, as well as proud for the Colonel's (I fear) favourable opinion of my public services, and especially for the handsome manner he has been pleased to notice the same, accompanied by the proffer of a fine high bred charger, *which*, I regret to say, such is the difficulty of getting an animal of that description to this place, or farther West, without injury, and the uncertainty of finding me in this section of country, even were I to make the attempt, and should I succeed in getting him brought here, and were I to order him to my plantation, he might be neglected, *which* would be to me a source of such mortification, as well as in the event of injury in getting him here, as to compel me to decline the Colonel's kind and disinterested offer, for *which* I am duly grateful, and *which* cannot be forgotten by me. At the same time, should our threatened difficulties with Great Britain result in an appeal to arms, *which* I sincerely hope will not be the case, or our relations with that country assume such a character as to induce the President to have the whole, or a large portion of the troops now here, withdrawn to more important points along our Southern and Eastern sea-coast, and it should be my lot to accompany them, and to be assigned to duty in Louisiana, *which*, in all probability will be the case, I will with pleasure and many thanks accept Rocky Mountain, and take the proper steps to have him delivered to me, and will use him as a parade horse in peace, and a charger in event of war; and no matter what position may be assigned me, either in peace or in war, I will endeavour to conduct myself in such a way as not to impair, much less to forfeit, the good opinion of Colonel Wynn, as well as that of many other valuable friends, all of *which* I will thank you to communicate to the Colonel, as well as all I have stated in relation to his valued and highly valuable donation.

[The residue of the letter, relating to other matters, is omitted.]

With respect and esteem, your friend truly,
Z. TAYLOR.

### The Liberty Party.

Gerrit Smith's party hitherto known as the Liberty League, but for the future to be called the Liberty Party, held its Convention at Canastota on the 28th ultimo. A very meagre account of it appears in the *Model Worker*, from which we copy the Resolutions as an evidence that there is a body of men who still call themselves by the name of Liberty Party. The meeting issued an address which is commendably short, but for which we have not room. It embraces its whole creed in this paragraph:—

The Liberty Party is as comprehensive as Civil Government. It aims to set up a righteous Civil Government. From the first its chosen principle of action has been the "equal rights of all men." What, if, in times past, it has been unfaithful to this principle!—so much the less can it afford to be unfaithful to it hereafter. The Liberty Party, must, evermore, insist, that Civil Government shall render to every class of its subjects every protection, which it owes them. In no otherwise can it hope for the *Divine blessing*. In no otherwise can it hope to be useful.

The Resolutions were as follows:

1st. Resolved, That the "equal rights of all men" has, from the time of the organization of the Liberty party, been its chosen principle of action; and that its former failures to make an impartial and universal application of this principle cannot justify, but should effectually guard against, the further repetition of such failures.

2d. Resolved, That the papers adopted by the Macedon Lock Convention in June, 1847, as well as those adopted by the Buffalo Convention in June, 1848, are, substantially, just expositions of the doctrines and duties of the Liberty Party.

3d. Whereas of the small number to which the Liberty Party is reduced by the desertions from it to Mr. Hale and Mr. Van Buren, nineteen-twentieths, if not, indeed, a larger proportion, hold a faith in common with that of the Liberty League; and whereas the Liberty Party should not be regarded as having forfeited its name by means of the treachery to its principals, wide-reaching as that treachery is; Resolved, Therefore, that however strong the reasons which the Liberty League had for refusing to return to the Liberty Party, ere that Party was purified by the desertions from it, there are no longer any hinderances in the way of such return.

4th. Resolved, That so far from regarding the Liberty League as a destroyer, we regard it as a saviour of the Liberty Party: and that, under a deep sense of gratitude for its faithful and able inculcation of sound Liberty Party truth, we affectionately invite it to merge itself into that Party.

5th. Whereas, there are Land Reformers, and Peace men, and other Reformers, who have come to see that they have no right to make a single issue at an election, and no right to choose persons for civil office, who are not intent on doing justice to all the subjects and to all the interests of Civil Government—Resolved, Therefore, that we hope that they will not delay to blend themselves with us, and take part with us in the endeavour to set up a Civil Government, which shall put down chattel Slavery, and land monopoly, and tariff robbery, and standing armies and navies, and every other political oppression—a Government, in short, which shall fulfil all righteousness.

### Suspected Abolitionists.

Some few days previous to the arrival of the new steamship Falcon, at this port, two anonymous communications were received from New York, by Major Crossman, stating that several negroes were coming out on the steamer, nominally as hands, but for the real purpose of tampering with such slaves as they could come in contact with, and inducing them to run away. One of the letters stated that the negroes were employed by the Abolitionists in New York. His honour the Mayor, expecting that the steamer would land in the Third Municipality, promptly informed Recorder Suzeneau of the information he had received, and instructed him to send officers on board as soon as the vessel arrived. The Falcon having passed up and landed in Lafayette, contrary to expectations, Lieut. Bellow of the Third Municipality Police, went before Judge McGory of Lafayette, (the Mayor being absent,) and made an affidavit on the information received by Mayor Crossman. Warrants were issued, and five negroes on board the steamer were arrested. They were brought before Judge McGory, where the captain and agents appeared in their behalf. After a little delay, the negroes were allowed to return on board the steamer, on a bond being given that they would be kept on board during the stay of the vessel in port, and carried out of the State when she leaves. No search was made for papers, and it is not known, therefore, whether the negroes were prepared to carry on operations in the abolition line or not.

The communications referred to, in the above paragraph from the *New Orleans Picayune*, were sent, we have heard, from this city by some parties who were chagrined at the employment of coloured persons, on board the "Falcon," and took this, as they supposed, effectual method to prevent a repetition of such an offence against the prescriptive rights of white people. The story, whether true or not, is not an "abolition lie," as it originates in quite a different source, and one which would be likely to be in possession of correct information. We see no reason to doubt it, and much to believe it true. It is in entire accordance with the usual treatment of coloured people by their white countrymen, who will permit them to get a scanty subsistance by filling the most menial offices of Society, when they the white "niggers" do not chose to fill these offices themselves.

FREE SOIL MEETING.—An immense and enthusiastic meeting of the Free Soilers was held in the Park in this city, on Tuesday evening, and speeches were made by John Van Buren and other distinguished leaders of the party. We have no room for a report of the proceedings this week, but shall publish the Resolutions, and perhaps a speech or two, in our next issue.

FREDERICK HECKER, a distinguished German Patriot, and leader of the Republican party in Germany, arrived in this city a few days since, and was welcomed with great enthusiasm by his countrymen. He was received at the City Hall by a Committee of the Common Council.

## Domestic Correspondence.

From our Boston Correspondent.

NO. XXXVIII.

THE ARGUMENT—*The Correspondent again in bad company, and how—The A. B. C. F. M., its hobby and its horsemanship—The platform—The D. D's—The laymen—Faith become Sight—The Correspondent believeth and trembleth—He describeth their outer man.—Long faces and long heads—Ill health—A hint to Mr. Thackrah—Slavery and its exorcists—The troublers of Israel cease from troubling, and on small provocation—The correspondent augureth well from Debt and Desertion—He turneth to the World—He praiseth it—As also the Flesh and the Devil—He dogmatizeth touching the Millenium and Newspapers—Political Funniments—Mr. Adams's District—Free Soilers, Whigs, Kilkenny Cats, Mr. Mann, Van Amburgh, Herr Driesbach, the son of Sirach, Lions, Dragons, Wicked Women and the Happy Family—Mr. Mann magnifieth his office—Perplexity of Parties—Free Soil Action—Whig Action—"The Rivals, or the Double Arrangement"—Whig County Convention—The Correspondent contradicteth Dr. Watt's—He distinguisheth between Edification and Entertainment—He describeth the Capulet and Montague feud of Norfolk—The Debate—The Result—Partizan Arithmetic—Democratic Convention—Gen. Cushing—Mr. Whitaker of S. C.—His opinion of South Carolina and the Correspondent's, &c., &c., &c.*

BOSTON, Oct. 7th, 1848.

I am afraid that you will think me given over to a reprobate mind and going down hill post haste; but the fact is, I have been in bad company again. When I wrote to you last, I had been sitting by the dying bed of that impenitent sinner the Third Political Party; and now I have been consorting with that long-faced, broad-phylectered, black-coated, white-cravatted Pharisee, the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. I remember a year or so ago, in one of my letters, I wished that when

"Next the Board did ride abroad,
I might be there to see;"

and now that it was obliging enough to canter its hobby directly past my very door, the least I could do was to go and look at it. And its curvettings and friskings were very well worth looking at. Some of the acts of Horsemanship were worthy of Ducrow himself. Particularly the attempt to ride on two horses going in opposite directions as Slavery and Christianity. It was a failure, to be sure; but the attempt was none the less intrepid and admirable.

The Meeting was held in the Tremont Temple, and lasted for three days. The attendance on the part of the public, though respectable, was not large. There was always plenty of room, I speak of the business meetings, in the daytime. I dare say the religious meetings in the evenings were full enough. The Platform was filled with the Corporate Members of the Board. And a fearful sight it was to see! Such an agglomeration of black coats, white cravats, double-breasted satin waistcoats, and elongated physiognomies as was terrible to look upon! There were revealed in the flesh the notorious Doctors in Divinity whose names have long been familiar to us all; but who have been rather impersonalities than realities, "beings of the mind,' from never having been beheld in the body. And there were the devout laymen, the Governors, Judges and Chancellors—famous in Church and State, scarcely less formidable than the Doctors in Divinity themselves. We mingled with the crowd, and gazed with wonder and awe.

Two characteristics were marked enough upon their outer men. Shrewdness and ill-health. They were not merely *long faced*; one could not look at them and doubt their being *long-headed*, too. All the characteristic marks of the American mind were stamped upon the countenances. They evidently knew what they were about, and understood their vocation thoroughly. And the way in which they disposed of the unpleasant ultraisms which modern fanaticism had forced upon their notice, was in the highest degree creditable to their sagacity and skill. The haggard, worn, unwholesome look which generally prevailed, was also unmistakeable, both among the great men on the platform and the lesser ones upon the floor. Very different, I can tell you, from the comfortable, rubicund, well-fed look of our Episcopal friends. A distinction which I recollect you have yourself remarked and remarked upon. The saving of souls, one would think, out of the pale of the Church, must be very hard work. Mr. Thackrah should put it down among the unwholesome trades and handicrafts.

It is altogether too late in the day for me to give you any account of proceedings which you have already published. Suffice it to say that that perturbed spirit Slavery would intrude itself, and compelled the Board to devote pretty much the whole of the time given to business to the consideration of the best method of exorcising it and laying it in the Red Sea. The formula furnished by the Board in the Report of the Secretary and the Letter to the Missionaries should have summoned the spectre to the presence with double power. But it seemed to give satisfaction to the troublers of that Israel. President Blanchard, Mr. Lovejoy, of the Emancipator, and Rev. Jonathan Curtis, the former President of the N. H. A. S. Society, who dragged in the Child Question at New York in 1840, all seemed charmed with it; although it virtually left the question where it was before it was moved at all. The debt of the Board, doubled since last year, is a favourable sign of the times. And the circumstance that, for the first time for many years, not a single town or city has invited them to meet in it next year, with the offer of hospitalities, really looks as if the people were beginning to regard it not merely as an expensive, but as a discreditable guest.

I have not, however, been so absorbed in the affairs of the Church as to have entirely neglected those of the World. Indeed, what should we unlucky Letter-writers do, were it not for the World, the Flesh, and the Devil? What Newspaper Correspondents will do in the Millennium is past my finding out. But, perhaps, Newspapers, like other deadly Sins, will be extinct races in those golden days, while Pens, Ink, and Paper will he cast out into the place appointed for transgressors. But a truce to Theological Speculation. I have had my eye, I can assure you, upon the various political *funniments* which are to be seen in the region round about, and of which the world is so fortunately full in these latter days. Among others, it was my lot to attend the Free Soil and the Whig District Conventions for the Eigth (better known as Mr. Adams's) Congressional District, and which resulted in the odd phenomenon of those two Kilkenny cats finding themselves seated, and purring in unison, one upon the right and the other upon the left shoulder of Mr. Mann. Van Amburgh must be a fool to this gentleman as a tamer of wild beasts. Herr Driesbach thought no small beer of himself because he drove a lion in a gig from one cage to another; but this is nothing to his skill as a Whig who can drive "a span" of parties from West Newton to Washington. The Son of Sirach makes no secret of his preferring the society of a lion and a dragon to keeping house with a wicked women. But what is living with lions and dragons, or even with a wicked women, compared to keeping house with two political parties that hate each other like the Whigs and Free Soilers? The gentleman who exhibits the Happy Family, consisting of a Cat, a Rat, a Bird, a Dog and other natural enemies living together in unity, is the only artist worthy to be compared to Mr. Mann.

Your readers out of Massachusetts may not know that, last August, Mr. Mann addressed a letter to his constituents, in which he said that he regarded his duty to the State as Secretary of the Board of Education, as paramount to his obligations to any Political Party; and, therefore, lest he should neutralize his influence in the cause of Education, he thought it best to withdraw from the political arena, and requested his friends not to nominate him for the next Congress. Having magnified his office in this extraordinary manner, both parties were puzzled what to do. It would not do for either to let the other take him on his own terms, for he would be sure to have votes enough to prevent the election of any rival, if not to secure his own. So both claimed him as their own, and defied the other to set up anybody else. The Free Soil Convention met first, but were by no means of one mind in the premises. One division, represented by the Hon. William Jackson, was for nominating him, without any intimation that they considered his acceptance of the nomination as a virtual joining of the party. Mr. Jackson said that Mr. Mann had told him, in so many words, "that no circumstances could induce him to vote for Zachary Taylor." To be sure, it afterwards evolved that this was said six months ago, when nearly the whole Massachusetts delegation would have said the same thing. Another division thought that consistency required of them to nominate none but a pledged Free Soil man. But as the opposition to the full Free Soil Platform was withdrawn, and a stringent resolution passed denouncing any Massachusetts Member who should dare to vote for Taylor, should the election come into the House, the nomination was made unanimously, with the understanding on the part of the members, as appeared from their speeches and private conversation, that Mr. Mann could not accept the nomination without virtually joining the Free Soil Party.

The next day, the Whig Convention met and nominated Mr. Mann without opposition or discussion. All that was said, besides the remarks of the mover of the Resolution, was a statement by the Hon. David A. Simmons that he had been assured by a distinguished Member of Congress, at the Worcester State Convention, that "Mr. Mann was *right and right throughout*." Mr. Simmons made no comment upon this remark; but it is not to be supposed that a Whig Member of Congress could mean by another's being "*right and right througout*" anything more or less that he might be depended upon to vote for Taylor. No questions were asked, however, and the nomination was made by acclamation. After the Address and Resolutions were passed the District Convention adjourned with three cheers for TAYLOR, FILLMORE, AND MANN! Both of these nominations Mr. Mann has accepted in as nearly the same words as possible. And thus he stands in the queer predicament of being the candidate, at the one and the same time, of the two most bitterly hostile parties in the country, each claiming him as theirs. For the Free Soilers certainly would not have nominated him had they believed he would vote for Taylor; nor is it likely the Whigs would, had it been certain that he would vote for Van Buren. But both parties made this leap in the dark with their eyes open. Both knew the position which Mr. Mann's eccentric notions of what was due to his public duty and to his personal honour had induced him to take, and whichever of them find, when the light comes, that they have broken their shins over it, will have nobody to thank but themselves.

After the District Convention was over, the Norfolk County Convention met to nominate State Senators, and then it appeared that however liberal the Hunker Whigs might be in their hatred of Democrats and Free Soilers, they still had some left for each other. Dr. Watts says, I believe,

"O, what an entertaining sight,
Are brethren that agree!"

But Dr. Watts was mistaken. It is no such thing. As an eminent Unitarian Doctor in Divinity, of Boston once said (before Theodore Parker had made them cautious in their speech) after taking for his text the passage where Joshua commands the sun and moon to stand still, "*I don't believe a word of it!*" Brethren that *agree* may be the more *edifying* sight of the two, but brethren that *disagree* are vastly the more *entertaining*. I give you my honour as a gentleman that I was never better entertained in my life, than on this occasion.

You must know that the county of Norfolk is divided by a perfect Capulet and Montague feud between two Roxbury gentlemen. Its origin I have never been curious to inquire: but, I am told, it enters into all the Whig County politics. Last year, the head of the Capulet faction was elected by the Senate, though his election by the people was defeated by the efforts of the Montagues. An informal ballot in this Convention, showed that the Montague candidate had a majority. Upon this a Mr. Swan, somewhat notorious for his *very* American School Readers, and a partizan of the Montague, moved an immediate actual ballot. Mr. Lovering, one of the Capulets, though interrupted, insisted upon a reason being rendered why the usual practice of re-electing a Senator should not be followed in the case of Mr. Capulet? To which Mr. Swan replied denying the right of any man to ask why or how he should vote. He was not so accustomed to speak and to cite precedents, as Mr. Lovering, [who, God help him, is a lawyer]; but if it came to that, he would say that when the second nomination of Mr. Montague was in question, two or three years before, there was no one more active against it than Mr. Lovering. Mr. Hixon said he should vote for Mr. Capulet, whether he was nominated or not. (Hisses.) Mr. Arnold said that there was danger of the dissolution of the Whig Party in the County. [No!] Gentlemen may say "no;" but it is true. He protested against bringing personal quarrels into the County Conventions. If custom was departed from, defeat was certain. The Free Soil Party was gaining ground. Conciliation was necessary. Mr. Swan foresaw this threat of a quarrel in the party. As to "personal quarrels" he knew of none such. (Voices, "False!" "Not true!") Any one who said he had any motive but the promotion of Whig principles, said what was false! (Voice, "I can prove that the gentleman is mistaken!") Mr. Sheriff Adams, with some warmth, exclaimed, here, "the gentleman says he knows of no quarrel, and, yet, last year he got up a split ticket! A split ticket with fictitious names upon it!" Here there was an interruption, and a general *scrimmage*. I was afraid, at one time, that "their little hands might tear each other's eyes!" But at last they had an actual ballot, when it appeared that Mr. Capulet had 39 votes to 38 for his rival, whereupon Mr. Swan with a zeal worthy of a better cause, moved for a new ballot, on the ground that neither had a majority! The man was mortal, though a schoolmaster, and his party spirit was too much for his arithmetic. I could not but exclaim inwardly, on witnessing these divisions in the True Anti-Slavery Movement, (which the Whigs, who must know, declare their party to be,) "if it be true, as Daniel Webster says, that 'the only hope of the country lies in the united Whig Party of the United States,' and if the Whig Party of the United States be not more united than that of Norfolk County, why, then, the Lord have mercy upon the Country!"

I have not time to tell you of the Democratic Convention I attended last week. Having been at the Free Soil and Whig Conventions, at Dedham, I felt bound in honour to go to the Democratic one,

"—— lest all the world,
Should say that I was proud!"

But the Hero of the Ditch of Metamoras, as some political orator I have heard this summer called General Cushing, made a speech worth noting. And so did Mr. Daniel K. Whitaker, a Massachusetts man, bred a Unitarian minister, now a South Carolina slaveholder, and Editor of the Southern Review. It was a speech fitted for the meridian of South Carolina (though it seemed *to do* for that of the Norfolk Democrats) an impudent defence of Slavery, and an insolent defence of Southern assumption. He talked about "the chivalrous and high-minded state of his adoption!" Little bragging, bullying, beggarly South Carolina to wit, that is afraid of a Northern black man, and is obliged to come to us to pay some $70,000 of her postage bill! Bah!

D. Y.

# Foreign Intelligence.

SEVEN DAYS LATER

## FROM EUROPE.

ARRIVAL OF THE CAMBRIA.

The *Cambria* arrived at Boston on Friday last, having sailed from Liverpool on the 22d ult. The accounts she brings from Ireland are of the entire suppression of all disturbances. It appears moreover that the reports hitherto received have been very much exaggerated. No bridge has been taken down, no attack has been made on Carragbmore, and the insurgents—if such they may be called—fled with precipitation at the approach of the police.

The State prisoners have been removed to Clonmel where their trial commences immediately.

In Paris the Assembly has been engaged in a debate on the Organization of Labour. The following interesting debate on Capital Punishment, Slavery, and the Maintenance of Religious Establishments we copy from Jerrold's Newspaper.

Of political affairs the same paper thus speaks:—

We have elsewhere given a few remarks to the way in which business has in the course of the week been transacted by the National Assembly. The debate on the articles of the Constitution drags its slow length along, and if no quicker progress be made may last the winter. There was rather an interesting discussion on the 5th article of the Constitution—"The penalty of death is abolished in political matters."

M. BOVIGNIER demanded the suppression of the last three words of the article, contending that the penalty of death was not a necessity, that it was not either essential for the security and preservation of society, as stated by Messrs. Aylies and Freslon, the only two members who had spoken in its favour on the former debate on the question.

M. EMILE LEROUX examined the question under the point of view of social interest. Capital punishment, in his opinion, was necessary and indispensable for the protection of society and its members. That penalty had been abolished, in 1832, for incendiarism, coining, and forgery, and the National Assembly now gave full satisfaction to public opinion by abolishing it for political offences. This was all it could concede without danger to society.

M. Wolowski afterwards ascended the tribune, but cries of "La cloture La cloture" (Enough, enough") arise on all sides, and the President having consulted the Assembly, the discussion was brought to a close. Upwards of 20 members having next called for a division on the amendment of M. Buvignier, a ballot took place:—

| | |
|---|---|
| For the amendment | 216 |
| Against it | 498—282 |

M. WALFERDIN moved that capital punishments, in ordinary matters, should be abolished after the 1st January, 1850.—Rejected.

M. MIREAU proposed, as the natural consequence of the abolition of capital punishment in political matters, that of penalties, carrying with them dishonour and infamy.

M. WOIRHAYE, in the name of the Constitution Committee opposed the amendment. The Assembly, by adopting it would, he said, decide that every time one or more citizens conspired to overturn the Government they would be guilty of a crime which deserved to be punished, but with lenity and every kind of respect for its authors.—Rejected.

M. DELUDRE next moved that the penalty of death to punish the crime of high treason against the nation be preserved.—Rejected.

M. CHARTON made another attempt to obtain the abolition of the penalty of death, which he proposed to replace for non-political crimes, by solitary imprisonment for life.—Rejected.

Another amendment of M. Favart in favour of the abolition of the penalty of death experienced a similar fate. After which the 5th article was adopted.

M. DERRIEN trusted that the penalty should be in future applied only in cases of absolute necessity.

The 6th article of the Constitution was afterwards adopted without discussion. It ran thus—"Slavery cannot exist on any French land."

The PRESIDENT then read the 7th article '—"Everybody freely professes his religion, and is entitled, in the exercise of his creed, to an equal protection from the State. The ministers of the religious worships recognized by the State have alone the right to receive a salary from the State."

M. PIERRE LEROUX demanded that the article be confined to these words, "Everybody freely professes his religion." He advocated the necessity of separating the Church and State. The Concordat was, he said, a work of hypocrisy, used by those who invoked it as an instrument of Government. They recognized neither God nor humanity. As respected the salary of the clergy, M. Leroux maintained that its suppression would be of the highest importance for the emancipation of the Church. M. Leroux having in the course of his speech questioned the liberality of the Protestant clergy, M. Coquerel replied that "official Protestantism," as M Leroux had called it, had ever desired liberty, not only for itself but for every body else.

The amendment of M. Leroux was rejected.

M. BOUZIQUE proposed that the ministers of the churches which should establish themselves in future, be paid by the State the moment the number of their adherents amounted to at least 50,000.—Rejected. The article was then adopted.

PARIS has this week shown more of electioneering excitement than perhaps on any previous occasion. There were, as we have stated, three vacancies for the representation of Paris. The election commenced on Sunday, and the lists were to be sent in for scrutiny on Monday night. Canvassing was more open and systematic than on previous occasions, tickets and handbills setting forth the merits of the respective candidates. These were distributed by all classes. At one point (Boulevard du Temple) among other persons occupied in this way on Sunday, were three ladies and a gentleman, elegantly dressed, who solicited votes for Prince Louis Napoleon. Numerous groups were formed on other points, speechifying and declaiming. In some cases the speakers were compelled to "move on." In other instances, at the Bourse for example, they were less violent in language, but more determined in attitude. Divers tricks were resorted to. "On Monday," says *Galignani*, "two men appeared at the office for receiving votes for representatives in the rue Montmartre, and tendered their bulletins and certificates; but one of the members of the office declared that both the bulletins were false, for he knew the persons they pretended to be, and who had long ago left Paris. While this was being deliberated upon, the two pseudo-electors made their escape. No time was lost in pursuing them, and they were taken and carried before the commissary of police, to whom they at once confessed the fraud, excusing themselves on the ground of their anxiety for the success of candidates whose names they had given in"—a plea that would excuse any fraud where public principles were concerned. On Wednesday evening the following result was made public:—

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Louis Napoleon. | 111,900 | Returned |
| Achille Fould (Moderate of the Thiers' party) | 78,818 | Returned |
| Raspail (a State prisoner, implicated in the affair of May) | 67,215 | Returned |
| Thoré (Socialist) | 64,749 | |
| Cabet (Communist) | 65,318 | |
| Roger (Moderate) | 61,397 | |
| E. Adam (ditto) | 41,245 | |
| Marshal Bugeand | 39,034 | |
| M. Delessert | 35,642 | |

It is generally held that many causes have been at work to ensure the success of Louis Napoleon, as all who wished ill to the present Government voted for him as the surest way of embarrassing that Government. Legitimists, "Reds," and a great many Socialists and Communists were among his supporters. Notwithstanding this, the popular feeling in his favour is evidently much stronger than was anticipated. The Paris correspondent of the *Times* (Thursday) says:—

"It would appear that we are, therefore, on the eve of a new struggle. Prince Louis Napoleon has been placed first among the successful candidates by the Socialists, Communists, and Terrorists of Paris, as a means of carrying out their own projects. But they were not the 'Red' men who returned him for the Moselle, for the Yonne, for the Orne, for the North, or for the Charente; and we are told he has been chosen by all these. What do these facts—those six nominations—announce? What interference do they suggest? I am bound to supply the answer, but disclaiming all feeling of my own on the subject. The conviction on the mind of nearly every man I meet is that, if the Prince makes no false step, he will be elected President of the Republic."

Many more of the soldiers voted for Louis Napoleon than was expected, and much fewer for Marshal Bugeaud.

The news from Italy is disastrous. Messina is in ruins. The report is that the entire population left the city and retired into the country on the 8th, having previously mined the town, determining to fire the mine so soon as the Neapolitans had entered it. Soon after the Neapolitans took possession of it, and in the evening the Sicilians blew up the city, burying the Neapolitans in its ruins. Immediately after the explosion of the mine the Sicilians re-entered the city and massacred all whom the explosion had spared.

The *Conciliatore* of Florence, of the 9th, announces from Rome that a political league between Rome, Sardinia, and Tuscany, is all but signed.

A sanguinary contest has again taken place at Naples between the people and troops. From Vienna, Frankfort, Leipsic, there are accounts of insurrections. In Vienna the disturbances arose from the old difficulty of the usages of the labourers; and in Frankfort, great dissatisfaction exists from the determination of the Assembly to make its determination not to approve of the armistice between Prussia and Denmark. There had been some fighting which was not terminated at the latest accounts. At Leipsic the barricades erected by the workmen had been captured, and order restored without much bloodshed.

## Married.

At St. Clement's Church, on Thursday morning, 5th inst. by Rev. A. S. Leonard, DANIEL A. MATTHEWS to SARAH E. only daughter of George A. Webb and grand daughter of Matthew L. Davis, Esq. all of this City.

## Died.

In this city, on Saturday, the 7th instant JULIA FULTON, wife of CHARLES BLIGHT, and eldest daughter of the late Robert Fulton, in the 39th year of her age.

At Blackwell's Island, October 3, in the Insane Asylum, EDMUND BURKE, 36, well known as the former editor of the New England Washingtonian, in Boston, and as an able temperance advocate.

At his residence on the Reservation, in the vicinity of Syracuse aged 40 years, ABRAM LA FORT, the head chief of the Onondaga tribe of Indians.

In Bensalem, Bucks county, on the 23d ult. PETER LONGSTRETH, familiarly known as "Guinea Pete," aged 102 years. Peter was a native of Africa, and had a wife and children there. Being a trader he went on board a French ship to buy goods, and was detained and carried off for a slave. He was first taken to France, and on the voyage from thence to the West Indies, the ship was taken by Commodore Decatur and carried into Philadelphia. Where he, and the rest of the cargo, were placed out mostly among the society of Friends to acquire the language and habits of the country. Peter was taken by the Longstreth family in Warminster, Bucks county, and after staying some time, went to work for himself, married another wife, and by industry soon acquired sufficient means to purchase a house and lot, on which he resided most of the remaining part of his life. Although he could speak the Arabic fluently, yet he never acquired sufficient of the English language to enable him to express his ideas with facility, or to be easily understood.

In Cambridge, Massachusetts, September, 26th, at the residence of NATHAN RICE, Mrs Desire Lincoln, relict of Dr. Levi Lincoln, of Hingham, aged 78 years.

In Hingham, Massachusetts, 3d instant, at the residence of Mr. Jairus Lewitt, Mrs. ELIZA N. RICE, wife of NATHAN RICE, of Cambridge, and daughter of the late Dr. Levi Lincoln, of Hingham, aged 52 years.

In Beverly Massachusetts 23d ult. MRS. RANTOUL, wife of Hon ROBERT RANTOUL.

### This Week's Paper.

FOURTH PAGE.—*Poetry*: This World is full of Beauty: Versicles; The Season. *Miscellany*: Mateo Falcone; Louis Blanc in London. Gleanings from Foreign Publications.

FIRST PAGE.—*Selections*: Influence of Abolition efforts on Slavery at the South; Letter to Major Noah; F. Douglass's Letter to H. G. Warner Esqr. (Editor of the Rochester Courier;) Address of the Exeter (England) Anti-Slavery Society to their fellow Citizens.

SECOND PAGE.—*Selections*: Address of Exeter (England) Anti Slavery Society concluded from the First Page. &c. &c.

# Notices.

THE PENNSYLVANIA ANTI-SLAVERY FAIR OF 1848.

Demands of all the friends of the slave in this region, prompt and vigorous efforts in its preparation. We know some of them, both in town and country, have long been busily at work in its behalf. So well is it understood and felt, that the Fair belongs to Pennsylvania Abolitionists generally, that our Annual summons to the work seems scarcely needed, and almost a form. But we issue it as a word of remembrance to the interested, and to arouse the lethargic—and to announce—at this important crisis—to an increasingly sympathizing community, an opportunity to labour for the cause. We invite the co-operation of every heart that loves the slave, and would prove its love by its deeds.

To our numerous fellow-labourers in city and country it cannot be unnecessary to speak on the subject of the best manner of preparing for the Fair. In such preparation they are well skilled. To those to whom the work may be new we say all pretty or marketable commodities will be valuable.

To *all* we say, make the slave's cause your own, if possible, and give liberally as God hath given you.

| | |
|---|---|
| *Sarah Pugh,* | *Esther Reckless,* |
| *A. Matilda Cassey,* | *Maria M. Davis,* |
| *Anna M. Hopper,* | *Elizabeth Gay,* |
| *Janette Jackson,* | *Hannah W. Haydock,* |
| *Margaret A. Griscom,* | *Elizabeth Davis,* |
| *Mary Grew,* | *Emma Parker,* |
| *Margaret Jones,* | *Gertrude K. Burleigh,* |
| *Hannah L. Stickney,* | *Emily A. Winslow,* |
| *Mary T. Stickney,* | *Clementine G. Ruby,* |
| *Sarah A. T. McKim,* | *Martha Carman,* |
| *Theresa K. Hallowell,* | *Sarah T. Child,* |
| *Hulda Justice,* | *Anna M. Child,* |
| *Elizabeth Carman,* | *Mary Shaw,* |
| *Harriet D. Purvis,* | *Margaret Forten,* |
| *Priscilla Lukens,* | *Esther Hogeland,* |
| *Sarah M. Douglass,* | *Esther Burr,* |
| *Elizabeth Clendenen.* | |

FIFTEENTH

## National Anti-Slavery Bazaar.

The undersigned, earnestly desiring the abolition of Slavery have been led, by the strength of their wish, carefully to consider what means may be found sufficient for the accomplishment of this great and holy object. They find that Slavery exists through the selfishness, the ignorance, the cowardice, the hypocrisy of the people. If the nation could be made more conscientious, disinterested, courageous, enlightened, and true to its own political and religious principles, the work were done. Until such nobility of spirit can be awakened in the land to make the clergyman, the farmer, the lawyer, the mechanic, the merchant and the politician, willing to renounce their hopes of worldly success, and see their respective careers of individual advancement closed up, apparently forever, by their allegiance to Freedom;—to make the men of the land feel themselves disgraced by their indifference to such a cause as this;—to make the Christians and citizens of the land willing to bear the suffering and odium consequent upon an adherence to the right against law and custom—until this can be accomplished, the Southern slaveholders are upheld in their sin by the powerful support of Christian fellowship, social sanction, and civil participation.

We determine, therefore, to strike at once at the root of Slavery, by appealing to the hearts and consciences of men and withdrawing their allegiance from such shameful claims of wrong, by the continual presentation of the paramount claims of Freedom and Humanity. Union being strength, that fact decides us to co-operate with any whose principles prove them to be trustworthy; who make the abolition of Slavery their primary object; and who, in addition to honesty of purpose, have sense and sagacity enough to make them safe coadjutors, by securing them from becoming the prey of the selfish set of hypocritical adventurers that every moral revolution calls forth. We find such a sufficient and trustworthy body nowhere but in the American Anti-Slavery Society. Years of close observation of its righteous principles and uncompromising practical workings, assure us that it has the elements of success. It continually sends forth lecturers to enforce the principles of justice and humanity among the people, and in a few years is found thereby to have exercised a controlling influence for good throughout the country. It dictates the course and bends the policy of every political party: and, speaking as it does from a stand above their selfish personal struggles, its words of everlasting truth are heard, and more and more obeyed. While calling on all to unite with it, it has ever, by the energy and rectitude of its progress, been free without licence, and effective without invidiousness. It is not too much to say in its praise, that its cause and its course repel all but the wise, the good, and the bold from active co-operation with it, and brand with dishonour the hand that approaches it to make it the instrument of any selfish purpose. It has no local attachments, no partizan or sectarian partialities, no hidden aim, no double purpose; while, at the same time, every observer notices how happily its labours prepare the way for every good work: for, though specific in its object, its great principle of *immediate individual reform*, without awaiting the gradualisms of party politics, legislative action, and judicial decision, is one of universal application.

This, therefore, is the mode of operation which commends itself to our reason and feelings. The agents and friends which such an association of necessity draws forth, are the ones that we wish to sustain. The periodicals that such an association employs are the ones that we wish to circulate. In the councils of such a body where all persons have equal rights of membership, the *whole* collective energy and judgment are constantly in use, and the chances and means of success consequently doubled.

Hence we find it to be our duty, in preparing for the FIFTEENTH NATIONAL ANTI-SLAVERY BAZAAR to commence in FANEUIL HALL, BOSTON, on Thursday, DECEMBER 21st, to devote the funds then raised, to sustain the AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY, in its great work of moral agitation and revolution in behalf of the enslaved, and confidently appeal to all good hearts EVERYWHERE, in aid of so noble an enterprise.

| | |
|---|---|
| *M. W. Chapman,* | *Sarah B. Shaw,* |
| *Ann T. G. Phillips,* | *Mary G. Chapman,* |
| *Helen E. Garrison,* | *Caroline Weston,* |
| *Mary May,* | *Susan C. Cabot,* |
| *Eliza Lee Follen,* | *Henrietta Sargent,* |
| *Sarah S. Russell,* | *Hannah Tufts,* |
| *Louisa Loring,* | *Eliza F. Meriam,* |
| *Mary Young,* | *Caroline F. Williams,* |
| *Mary Wiley,* | *Evelina S. A. Smith,* |
| *Anne Warren Weston,* | *Sarah H. Southwick,* |
| *Maria Lowell,* | *Ann R. Bramhall,* |
| *Francis Mary Robbins,* | *Harriet T. White,* |
| *Lydia Parker,* | *Abby Francis,* |
| *Harriet B. Hall,* | *Abby Southwick,* |
| *Catharine Sargent,* | *Harriet M. Jackson.* |

All persons desiring the privilege of co-operating with us in this joyful and holy work, are informed that the pecuniary value of donations of money and materials, is doubled to the cause through the means of the Bazaar, by the care, skill and ingenuity which are entrusted with their management.—*Supplies for the refreshment table are particularly desired.*

Friends of the cause aware of the advantages accruing to it from The Liberty Bell, are requested to forward their donations and articles *immediately*, or as soon as convenient.

Friends in England, Scotland, and Ireland, are requested to address their contributions as usual, to MARIA W. CHAPMAN, care of A. W. Weston, 21 Cornhill, Boston.

Contributions and letters from the American side of the Atlantic, hitherto addressed to M. W. Chapman, may be addressed to ANNE W. WESTON.

Communications from friends in the country respecting lodgings for ladies intending to furnish tables, should be addressed to ELIZA F. MERIAM, Boston.

Members of the Committee who will be in Europe during the remainder of the year, will be most happy to receive donations for the purchase of choice and rare foreign articles for the Bazaar. Address CAROLINE WESTON, 21 Cornhill, Boston.

Every friend who furnished evergreen for the decoration of the Hall last year, is entreated, for the sake of the slave, to continue the same good office, by *seasonably* gathering the requisite "running green," and red cedar trees, and bringing them to Boston, on Saturday, December 13th, thus allowing the indispensable three days before the 21st, for the arrangements.

## Poetry.

From the London Weekly Times.

### THIS WORLD IS FULL OF BEAUTY.

There is a voice within me,
And 'tis so sweet a voice,
That its soft lispings win me
Till tears start to mine eyes;
Deep from my soul it springeth,
Like hidden melody,
And evermore it singeth
This song of songs to me—
"This world is full of beauty,
As other worlds above;
And if we did our duty,
It might be full of love!"

If faith and loving-kindness,
Passed coin 'twixt heart and heart,
Bigotry's darkest blindness
And malice would depart.
If men were more forgiving,
Were kind words oft'ner spoken,
Instead of scorn so grieving,
There would be few heart-broken.
When plenty's round us smiling,
Why wakes this cry for bread?
Why are crush'd millions toiling,
Gaunt—clothed in rags—unfed?
The sunny hills and valleys,
Blush ripe with fruit and grain,
But the lordling in the palace
Still robs his fellow men.
O God! what hosts are trampled
Amid this press for gold,
What noble hearts are sapp'd of life,
What spirits lose their hold!
And yet upon this God-blessed earth
There's room for every one:
Ungarner'd food still ripens,
To waste, rot in the sun;
For the world is full of beauty,
As other worlds above;
And if we did our duty,
It might be full of love!

Let the law of bloodshed perish,
Wars, gore and glory, splendour—
And men will learn to cherish
Feelings more kind and tender.
Were we true unto each other,
We'd vanquish Hate and Crime,
And clasp the hand of a brother,
In any land or clime!
If gold were not an idol,
Were mind and merit worth,
Oh, there would be a bridal
Betwixt high heaven and earth!
Were truth our utter'd language,
Angels might talk with men,
And God-illumin'd earth should see
The golden age again.
For the leaf-tongues of the forest—
The flower-lips of the sod—
The birds that hymn their raptures
Into the ear of God—
And the sweet wind that bringeth
The music off the sea,
Have each a voice that singeth
This song of songs to me.
This world is full of beauty
As other worlds above;
And if we did our duty,
It might be full of love.

T. G. M.

### VERSICLES.

*For Fathers and Mothers only) on an infant daughter's first walking:*

BY JAMES GREGOR GRANT.

Ha! ambitious little elf!
Off by thy adventurous self?
Fairly off? O fair betide thee!
With no living thing beside thee;
Not a chair to creep or crawl by;
Not a finger-tip to catch at;
Not a sleeve or skirt to snatch at;
Fairly off at length to sea,
Full twelve inches (can it be
Really, truly?) from the lee
Of mamma's protecting knee!

Fair and softly—soft and fairly—
Little bark, thou sail'st it rarely,
In thy new-born power and pride,
O'er the carpet's level tide,
Lurching, though from side to side,
Ever and anon, and heeling
Like a tipsy cherub reeling.
(If e'en cherubs, saucy gipsy!
Smile like thee, or e'er get tipsy!)
Even as though yon dancing mote
In the sunny air afloat,
Or the merest breath that met thee,
Might suffice to overset thee!

Helm a weather! steady, steady!
Nay, the danger's past already;
Thou, with gentle course, untroubled
Table-Cape full well has doubled.
Sofa-Point has shot a-head.
Safe by Footstool-Island sped.
And are steering, well and truly,
On for closet-Herbour duly!

Anchor now, or turn in time,
Ere within the torrid clime
Which the tropic fender bounds,
And with brazen zone surrounds;
Turn thee, weary little vessel,
Nor with further perils wrestle
Turn thee to refit a while
In the sweetly sheltering smile
Of thine own Maternal Isle—
In the haven of dear rest
Proffered by the doating breast
And the ever ready knee
Of a mother true to thee
As the best of mothers be!

Nay! adventurous little ship!
If thine anchor's still a trip,
And, instead of port, you choose
Such another toilsome cruise,
Wheresoe'er the whim may lead thee,
On! my treasure! and God speed thee!
Hackneyed as, perchance, they be,
Solemn words as these to me,
Nor from an irreverent lip
Heedlessly or lightly slip:
Even HE whose name I take
Thus, my dear one, for thy sake,
In this seeming idle strain,
Knows I take it not "in vain."
But as in a parent's prayer
Unto HIM to bless and spare!

We believe we have published these lines once or twice before—at least we ought to have done so:

### THE SEASON:

BY THOMAS HOOD.

SUMMER's gone and over!
Fogs are falling down!
And with the russet tinges,
Autumn's doing brown.

Boughs are daily rifled
By the busy thieves,
And the Book of Nature
Getteth short of leaves.

Round the tops of houses,
Swallows as they flit,
Give like yearly tenants,
Notices to quit.

Skies of fickle temper,
Weep by turns and laugh—
Night and day together,
Taking half-and-half.

So September endeth—
Cold and most perverse—
But the months that follow,
Sure will pinch us worse!

## Miscellany.

### MATEO FALCONE.

*Translated for the Standard, from the French of Prosper Mérimée.*

On leaving Porto-Vecchio and shaping one's course towards the interior of the island, the ground rises very rapidly, and after three hour's walking in winding paths, obstructed by great masses of rock, and sometimes stopped by deep ravines, one arrives on the border of a very extensive *maquis*. The maquis is the country of the Corsican shepherds, and of whomever is embroiled with justice. The Corsican labourer, in order to spare himself the trouble of manuring his land, sets fire to a certain extent of forest; if the flames spread farther than he needs, so much the worse. Let what will happen, he is sure to have a good crop by sowing in this ground, fertilized by the ashes of the trees which it bore. The wheat they carry away, but they leave the chaff, which would be troublesome to collect. The roots which have remained in the ground unburnt, shoot forth the following spring from their many branches, and in a few years become seven or eight feet high. It is this kind of tangled thicket which they call *maquis*. Different species of trees and shrubs compose it, mingled and confounded together as God pleases. It is only with an axe in his hand that a man can open a passage for himself, and there are *maquis* so thick and so tangled, that the mouflons themselves can hardly penetrate them.

If you have killed a man, go into the mâquis of Porto-Vecchio, and you can live there in safety; with a good musket, powder and balls. Do not forget a brown cloak garnished with a hood, which serves for covering and for bed. The shepherds will give you milk, cheese, and chesnuts; and you will have nothing to fear from justice or the relations of the dead, unless when you are obliged to go into the city to renew your ammunition.

MATEO FALCONE, when I was in Corsica, in 18—, had his house half a league from this mâquis. He was a rich man for the country; living nobly, that is to say, without doing anything, on the produce of his flocks which the shepherds, a wild, wandering tribe, pastured on the mountains. When I saw him, two years after the event I am going to relate, he appeared to me about fifty years old. Fancy a man, small, but robust, with curly hair black as jet, an aquiline nose, thin lips, large, penetrating eyes, and a complexion the colour of leather. His skill in rifle-shooting was considered extraordinary, even in his country, where they are all good marksmen. For instance, Mateo would never fire at a mouflon with deer-shot, but at a hundred and twenty paces he would bring it down with a ball, in the head or the shoulder at his choice. He used his arms as easily by night as by day, and they then related to me an instance of his skill which would appear incredible perhaps to one who has never travelled in Corsica. At a distance of eighty paces they placed a lighted candle behind a paper transparency as large as a plate. He took aim, they then extinguished the candle, and at the end of a minute, in the most profound darkness, he fired and pierced the transparency three times out of four.

With such transcendant merit, Mateo Falcone had a great reputation. He was as warm a friend, as he was dangerous as an enemy; in other respects obliging and charitable; he lived in peace with everybody in the district of Porto-Vecchio. But they related of him, that at Bastia where he married his wife, he had disembarrassed himself very vigorously of a rival, who was considered as redoubtable in war as in love: at least they attributed to Mateo a certain musket-shot which surprised this rival as he was shaving himself before a little mirror hung at his window. The affair slept and Mateo married. His wife, Giuseppa, gave him first three daughters (which enraged him not a little), and at last a son, whom he named Fortunato. He was the hope of his family, the heir of the name. The daughters were well married; their father could count at need on the poignards and carbines of his sons-in-law. The son was only ten years old, but he showed already a promising disposition.

One autumn day Mateo went out early with his wife, to visit one of his flocks in a glade of the mâquis. The little Fortunato wished to accompany them, but the meadow was too distant; besides, it was necessary that some one should remain to take care of the house; the father refused then; we shall see if he had not cause to repent it.

He had been absent several hours, and the little Fortunato was tranquilly extended in the sun, watching the blue mountains and thinking that the next Sunday he should go to dine in the city, with his uncle, the caporole,* when he was suddenly interrupted in his meditations by an explosion of fire arms. He rose and turned towards the side of the plain from whence the noise came. Other shots succeeded, fired at unequal intervals nearer and nearer; at last in the path which led from the plain to Mateo's house, appeared a man dressed in a pointed cap, such as they wear in the mountains, unshaved, covered with rags, and dragging himself along with difficulty, leaning on his musket. He had received a shot in the thigh.

This man was a bandit,† who had gone by night to buy powder in the city, and had fallen, on his route, into an ambuscade of Corsican Voltigeurs‡. After a vigorous defence, he was obliged to retreat hotly pursued, and firing from rock to rock. But he was very little in advance of the soldiers, and his wound made it impossible for him to gain the mâquis before being overtaken.

He approached Fortunato, and said to him:

"Thou art the son of Mateo Falcone?"

"Yes."

"I am Gianetto Sanpiero. I am pursued by the yellow collars.§ Hide me, for I can go no farther!"

"What would my father say if I should hide you without his permission?"

"He would say that you had done well."

"How do you know?"

"Hide me quickly. They are coming."

"Wait till my father returns."

"Wait! Malediction! They will be here in five minutes. Come hide me, or I will kill you."

Fortunato replied with the greatest sang-froid:—"Your musket is discharged, and there are no more balls in your pouch."

"I have my stiletto."

"But can you run as quickly as I can?" He made a leap and was out of reach.

*The Carporaux were in former times the chiefs who commanded the Corsican commons, when they rebelled against their feudal lords. They still give this name sometimes to a man, who, either in consequence of his property, his birth, or his numerous dependants, exercises an influence and a kind of effective magistracy over a *piere* or canton. The Corsicans divide themselves, by an ancient custom, into five castes: *gentiles hommes* (of whom some are *magnifiques*, others *signori*), *les caporali, les citoyens, les plébéiens, et les étrangers.*

† The word is here synonymous with proscribed.

‡ This is a corps raised within a few years by the Government, and which serves, together with a gendarmerie to maintain order.

§ The uniform of the Voltigeurs was a brown coat with a yellow collar.

"You are not the son of Mateo Falcone! Will you let me be arrested then before your house?"

The child appeared touched.

"What will you give me, if I hide you?" said he approaching.

The bandit fumbled in a leather pouch, which hung at his waist, and drew from it a five franc piece, which he had doubtless saved to buy powder. Fortunato smiled at the sight of the silver, he seized it and said to Gianetto: "Fear nothing."

He immediately made a large hole in a heap of hay near the house; Gianetto crept into it, and the child covered him with the hay in such a manner as to leave him air, and yet to make it seem impossible that it could hide a man. He devised also a very ingenious *ruse*. He took a cat and her kittens and established them quietly on the hay, in order to give it the appearance of not having been recently stirred. Then, noticing the traces of blood on the path near the house, he carefully covered it with dust, and that done, threw himself down again in the sun with the greatest tranquility.

Some minutes after, six men, in brown uniform, with yellow collars, commanded by an adjutant, appeared before Mateo's door. This adjutant was a distant relation of Falcone (in Corsica they count degrees of relationship much farther than elsewhere). His name was Tiodoro Gamba: he was an energetic man, very much feared by the Bandits, of whom he had already traced several.

"Good day, little cousin," said he, accosting Fortunato, "how you are grown!—Did you see a man pass just now?"

"Oh! I am not so tall as you are, my cousin," replied the child with a simple air.

"You will be, in time."

"But have you seen a man pass, tell me?"

"Have I seen a man pass?"

"Yes, a man with a pointed bonnet of black velvet, and a waistcoat embroidered with red and yellow?"

"A man with a pointed bonnet, and a waistcoat embroidered with red and yellow?"

"Yes; answer quickly, and don't repeat my questions."

"This morning M. le Curè passed before our door, on his horse Piero. He asked me how papa did, and I answered——"

"Ah! little rogue, you are mischievous! Tell me quickly which way Gianetto went, for it is he we seek, and I am certain he took this path."

"Who knows?"

"Who knows? I know that you have seen him."

"How can one see people pass when one is asleep?"

"You were not asleep, rascal, the rifle shots must have waked you."

"Do you think, then, my cousin, that your rifles make so much noise? My father's escopette makes a great deal more."

"The devil take you! I am sure you have seen Gianetto. Perhaps you have even hid him. Come, comrades, let us enter the house, and see if our man is not there. He went on one foot, and he has too much good sense, the rascal, to have tried to gain the mâquis, hobbling. Besides the tracks of blood stop here."

"And what will papa say?" asked Fortunato sniggering; "what will he say when he finds that some one has entered his house while he was gone?"

"Rogue!" said the adjutant Gamba taking him by the ear, "do you know that I can make you change your note? Perhaps if I should give you twenty strokes with the flat of my sabre, you would speak at last."

Fortunato still sniggered. "My father is Mateo Falcone!" said he with emphasis.

"Do you know, little rascal, that I can carry you to Bastia, and put you in a dungeon, on straw, with irons on your feet; I can have you guillotined if you do not tell me where Gianetto Sanpiero is."

The child burst into a laugh at this ridiculous threat. He repeated:

"My father is Mateo Falcone!"

"Adjutant," said one of the Voltigeurs in a low voice. "We had better not embroil ourselves with Mateo."

Gamba was evidently embarrassed. He talked apart with his soldiers, who had already searched the house. It was not a very long operation, for the cabin of a Corsican, consists only of one square room. The furniture is composed of a table, benches, chests, household utensils and weapons for the chase. Meanwhile the little Fortunato caressed his cat, and seemed to take a malicious pleasure in the confusion of his cousin and the Voltigeurs.

A soldier approached the heap of hay. He saw the cat, and thrust his bayonet carelessly into the hay, shrugging his shoulders as if he felt that his precaution was ridiculous. Nothing moved, and the child's face betrayed not the slightest emotion.

The adjutant and his troop, gave themselves roundly to the devil, already they began to look seriously across the plain, as if disposed to return from whence they came, when their chief, convinced that menaces would produce no impression upon the son of Mateo, determined to make one last effort, and try the power of caresses and presents.

"Little cousin," said he, "you are a lively, clever fellow, but you have played me a scurvy trick, and if I were not afraid of troubling my cousin Mateo, the devil take me if I would not carry you away with me."

"Bah!"

"But when my cousin returns, I will tell him the whole affair, and he will whip you till the blood comes, for having lied."

"How do you know?"

"You will see—but hold—be a brave boy, and I will give you something."

"And I, cousin, will give you a piece of advice, it is, that if you stay any longer, Gianetto will be in the mâquis, and then it will take more than a *luron* like you to find him.

The adjutant drew from his pocket a silver watch, worth about ten crowns; and observing that the little Fortunato's eyes sparkled at the sight of it, he held it suspended at the end of its steel chain, and said to him:

"Rogue! you would like to have a watch like this hung round your neck; you would walk in the streets of Porto-Pecchio as proud as a pea-cock; and people would ask you: 'What hour is it?' and you would say: 'Look at my watch.'

"When I am grown up my uncle, the corporole will give me a watch."

"Yes, but your uncle's son has one already—not as handsome as this, to be sure—he is younger than you are."

The boy sighed.

"Well, do you wish to have this watch, little cousin?"

Fortunato glanced at the watch from the corner of his eye. He resembled a cat, to whom one offers a whole chicken. As she feels that she is mocked she dares not put out her paw, and from time to time, turns away her eyes, that she may not yield to the temptation; but she licks her lips, and has the air of saying to her master:

"Your jest is cruel!"

Meanwhile the adjutant Gamba seemed to offer his watch in good faith. Fortunato did not stir his hand, but said with a bitter smile: "Why do you mock me?"

"Par Dieu! I do not mock you. "Only tell me where Gianetto is, and the watch is yours."

An incredulous smile appeared on the face of Fortunato; he fixed his black eyes on those of the adjutant, as if to read in them what faith he might put in his promises.

"May I lose my epaulet," cried the adjutant, "if I do not give you the watch upon this condition! My comrades are witnesses, and I cannot draw back."

Speaking thus, he held the watch nearer and nearer, till it almost touched the pale cheek of the boy, whose face showed the struggle that was going on in his mind between covetousness and the respect due to hospitality. His naked breast heaved violently, and he seemed almost stifling. All this time the watch turned, oscillated, and sometimes hit the end of his nose. At last his right hand was slowly raised towards it; the ends of his fingers touched it; it hung heavily in his hand, though the adjutant still held the end of the chain. The face was blue—the case newly furbished—in the sun it shone like fire. The temptation was too strong.

Fortunato raised his left hand and pointed over his shoulder, at the heap of hay against which he was leaning. The adjutant understood him instantly. He dropped the end of the chain, and Fortunato felt himself the sole possessor of the watch. He rose and sprang like a deer away from the heap of hay, round which the Voltigeurs immediately drew, to overturn it.

The hay was hardly stirred before a man, covered with blood, his poignard in his hand, appeared, but, as he tried to rise, his stiffened wound prevented him. He fell, the adjutant wrested from him his poignard, and he was bound in spite of his resistance.

Gianetto, lying on the ground, bound like a fagot, turned his head towards Fortunato, who had approached him. "Son of——," said he, with more contempt than anger. The boy threw towards him the piece of silver which he had received, feeling that he no longer deserved it, but the bandit paid no attention to this movement. He said with much *sangfroid* to the adjutant: "My dear Gamba, I cannot walk; you will be obliged to carry me to the city."

"You ran just now like a roe-buck," replied the triumphant adjutant; "but be easy: I am so well pleased to have you, that I could carry you a league on my back without being tired. We will make a litter for you, my comrade, with some branches and your cloak, and at the farm of Crespoli we shall find horses."

"Well," said the prisoner; "put a little straw in your litter, that I may be comfortable."

While the soldiers were occupying themselves, some in making a species of litter of the branches of the chestnut, others in dressing the wound of Gianetto, all of a sudden, at a turn of the path which led from the mâquis, appeared Mateo Falcone and his wife. The wife walked first, bowed down under the weight of an enormous sack of chestnuts, while the husband strolled along, carrying only a rifle in one hand and another *enbandoulière*: for it is degrading to a man to carry any other weight than his arms.

At the sight of the soldiers, Mateo's first thought was that they had come to arrest him. But why should he think so? Had he then any quarrel with the laws? No, he enjoyed a good reputation. He was, as they say, *in particularly good odour;* but he was a Corsican and a mountaineer, and there are few Corsican mountaineers, who upon closely scrutinizing their memory, do not find there some peccadillo, such as a rifle shot, a poignard thrust, or some other trifle. Mateo had a clearer conscience than most others; for ten years he had not pointed his musket against a man: but he was prudent, and prepared to make a good defence if it were needful,

"Wife," said he to Giuseppa, "put down your sack and be ready." She obeyed immediately. He gave her the rifle he carried *enbandoulière*, which would have embarrassed him. Then he loaded the one he had in his hand and advanced slowly towards the house, keeping close to the trees which bordered the road, and ready, at the slightest hostile demonstration, to throw himself behind the largest trunk, from whence he could fire under cover. His wife walked at his heels, carrying his reserved musket and his cartridge box. The duty of a good housewife, in case of combat, is to take care of her husband's arms.

On the other side, the adjutant was dismayed at seeing Mateo approach, with measured steps, his musket raised, and his finger on the trigger. If by chance, thought he, Gianetto was a relation of Mateo's, or if he was his friend, and he wished to defend him; the wadding of his two muskets will reach two of us, as sure as a letter by the post; and if he should aim at me, notwithstanding the relationship!——

In this perplexity he took a very courageous course, this was to advance alone towards Mateo, and relate the whole affair to him, accosting him as an old acquaintance;—but the short space which separated him from Mateo appeared terribly long.

"Hold! my old comrade," cried he, "how are you, *mon brave.* It is I, your cousin Gamba."

Mateo stopped, without a word, and as the other spoke, he gradually raised the barrel of his gun until it was directed towards the sky, at the moment the adjutant joined him.

"Good day, brother," said the adjutant, holding out his hand. "It is a long time since I have seen you."

"Good day, brother."*

"I stopped, in passing, to say good day to you and my cousin Pepa. We have made a long journey today, but we ought not to complain of our fatigue, for we have taken a famous prize. We have seized Gianetto Sanpiero."

"God be praised!" cried Giuseppa. "He stole a milk goat of ours, last week."

These words encouraged Gamba.

"Poor devil!" said Mateo, "he was hungry."

"The rogue defended himself like a lion," pursued the adjutant, somewhat mortified; "he killed one of my voltigeurs, and not content with that, he has broken Corporole Chardon's arm; but that was no great matter, he is only a Frenchman. Afterwards he was so well hidden that the devil could not have found him. Without my little cousin Fortunato, I should never have done it."

"Fortunato!" cried Mateo.

"Fortunato!" repeated Giuseppa.

"Yes, Gianetto was hid under that heap of hay; but my little cousin showed me the trick. I shall tell his uncle the Corporole, and he will send him a fine present for his trouble. And his name shall be in the report which I shall send to the Advocate-General."

"Damnation!" said Mateo, in a low voice.

They rejoined the party. Gianetto was already lying on the litter, prepared to go. When he saw Mateo in company with Gamba, he smiled a strange smile; then turning towards the door of the house, he spat upon the threshold saying: "House of a traitor!"

None but a man prepared to die, would have dared to pronounce the word traitor, in connection with Falcone. A dagger-thrust, which would not have needed to be repeated, would have immediately paid the insult. Now Mateo made no other gesture than that of carrying his hand to his forehead like one overwhelmed.

Fortunato had entered the house, on seeing his father arrive. He now reäppeared with a jug of milk, which he offered with lowered eyes to Gianetto. "Away from me!" cried the bandit, in a voice of thunder. Then turning to one of the soldiers: "Comrade, give me some drink," said he. The soldier placed his gourd in his hands, and the bandit drank the water given him by a man, with whom he had just exchanged shots. Then he requested them to bind his hands so that he could cross them on his breast, instead of tying them behind his back. "I love," said he, "to lie at my ease."

They endeavoured to satisfy him; the adjutant then gave the signal for departure, bid adieu to Mateo, who made no answer, and descended with quickened steps towards the plain.

Nearly ten minutes passed before Mateo opened his mouth. The boy glanced with an anxious eye, first at his mother, then at his father, who, leaning on his musket, looked at him with an expression of concentrated rage.

"You begin well!" said Mateo, at last, in a voice, calm, but frightful to whoever knew the man.

"My father!" said the child, advancing with tears in his eyes, as if to throw himself at his feet. But Mateo cried, "Begone from me!" And the boy remained, sobbing and motionless, some steps from his father.

Giuseppa approached. She had perceived the chain of the watch, the end of which hung out of Fortunato's shirt.

"Who gave you this watch?" asked she in a severe tone.

"My cousin, the adjutant."

Falcone seized the watch, and throwing it violently against a stone, it broke into a thousand pieces.

"Wife," said he, "is this child mine?"

The brown cheeks of Giuseppa became as red as a brick.

"What do you mean, Mateo, do you know to whom you are speaking?"

"Well! this child is the first of his race, who was ever a traitor."

Fortunato's sobs redoubled, and Falcone kept his lynx eyes fastened upon him. At last he struck the ground with the butt end of his musket, then threw it over his shoulder and taking the road to the mâquis, called to Fortunato to follow him. The boy obeyed.

Giuseppa ran after Mateo and seized his arm.—"He is your son," said she, in a trembling voice, fastening her black eyes on those of her husband, as if to read what was passing in his soul.

"Leave me," replied Mateo; "I am his father."

Giuseppa embraced her son and returned weeping to her cabin. She threw herself on her knees before an image of the Virgin and prayed fervently.

Meanwhile, Falcone followed the path some two hundred paces, till he arrived at a little ravine, where he stopped. He sounded the ground with the butt-end of his musket and found it soft and easy to dig. The place appeared suitable for his design

"Fortunato, go close to that great stone."

The boy did as he was commanded. Then he knelt.

"Say your prayers."

"My father, my father, do not kill me!"

"Say your prayers!" repeated Mateo, in a terrible voice.

The boy, sobbing and stammering, recited the *Patre* and the *Creedo*. The father responded "*Amen!*" in a strong voice at the end of each prayer.

"Are these all the prayers you know?"

"I know the *Ave Maria*, my father, and the litany, which my aunt taught me."

"They are very long, but no matter."

The boy finished the litany in a stifled voice.

"Have you finished?"

"Oh! my father, mercy! pardon me! I will do so no more! I will beseech my cousin the corporal to pardon Gianetto!"

While he yet spoke, Mateo raised his musket and took aim, saying: "May God pardon you!" The boy made a desperate attempt to rise and embrace his father's knees; but he had not time. Mateo fired and Fortunato fell stone dead.

Without glancing towards the body, Mateo took the road to his own house, to procure a spade to bury his son. He had walked but a few steps before he met Giuseppa, who had been alarmed by the shot.

"What have you done!" cried she.

"Justice."

"Where is he?"

"In the ravine. I am going to bury him. He died a Christian, and I will have a mass said. Send to my son-in-law Tiodoro Bianchi and tell him to come and live with us."

* The ordinary salutation among [illegible]ns.

### LOUIS BLANC IN LONDON.

The other day, M. Louis Blanc wrote to the *Times* that he would wait in England, in the calm of study and silence of retreat, until better days dawned upon France. He has, however, not yet sought the silence of retreat, but has again sought, and his letter has been admitted, into the columns the *Times*, to which journal he promises further communications. M. Louis Blanc seems to feel our contemporary's strictures more sensitively than might have been expected in one so mixed up with public life as he has been. His letter commands attention, as it gives a direct contradiction to many a charge against the writer, held as faith by many parties in England. He says to the *Times*:—

"You attribute to my system and to the National *Ateliers*—which you call my *Ateliers*—the miseries of the present situation of my country. Allow me to repel with all the indignation of an honest man, wounded in the most sensitive part of his heart, such a horrible responsibility. * * * * No, sir, no! Absolutely, I was nothing in the creation of the National *Ateliers*. It was M. Marie, then Minister of Public Works, who established them; it was M. Emile Thomas who was by M. Marie appointed to the direction of them. As for myself I affirm it, and I defy contradiction—I took no part in the formation of the National *Ateliers*, neither in their organization, nor in their direction, nor in their superintendence. If, then, there has been imprudence—and I believe there has—in assembling pell-mell, in the National *Ateliers* workmen, taken by chance from all professions; if there has been folly in giving them an uniform unproductive task, and in paying them for this unproductive labour, wages which were but alms in disguise; if this deplorable institution has become for the State so flagrant a cause of ruin that it has been necessary to crush it; if the workmen of the National *Ateliers*, when they ceased to receive their habitual wages, fell into despair; if, in short, a party among them have produced the insurrection of June under the influence of the most terrible misery—by what strange reversal of all the laws of justice can be imputed to me such results? to me, who, I repeat it, was a complete stranger to the National *Ateliers*, who disapproved of their being called into existence, who never put my foot into them"

"You impute to my system, Sir, the bloody disorders of Paris. I may remark that my system, has up to this time, received only two applications, altogether partial, and confined in a very narrow circle. But, far from condemning my doctrines, these two partial applications form the most striking justification of them; for, the associations of journeymen tailors, and that of journeymen saddlers, which I founded, still exist; they prosper, notwithstanding all that has been done to decry them, to destroy them; and it is to be remarked, that they did not join in the insurrection of June—a decisive fact which I recommend to the attention of all men of good faith!"

Certainly these are very remarkable statements and well calculated to remove from M. Louis Blanc much of the odium that has been attached to his name. He then, "not doubting the honour or gentle loyalty" of the *Times*, gives some extracts from his work, "L' Organization du Travail;" after which he quotes some passages from his "Histoire des Dix Ans" to show that he was not a man of blood or violence, or even what we should call of "physical force," but that he sought the establishment of his principles through the calm and regular development of public reason by the liberty of the tribune, the liberty of the press, and the right of discussion. Nay, more, that there was not in the book, he had written, or the speeches he had delivered one word, one single word, which counselled an appeal to violence, to brute force. We give one of the passages quoted from "L' Organization du Travail":—

"Violence is to be feared only when discussion is forbidden. Order has not better shields than study. If anger sometimes chastises evil, it is impotent for the production of good. A blind and savage impatience can only heap up ruins under which the seeds of justice and love would be smothered. It is not the question as to the displacing of wealth, but as to its universal expansion and multiplication. For the happiness of all—of all without exception—it behoves us to elevate the level of humanity."

M. Blanc then insists, that whilst he remained at the Luxembourg, the people exhibited an admirable example of moderation and resignation. "Was it not then," he asks, "that they pronounced the sublime sentence—"We have three months of misery to offer to the Republic?" He concludes with saying, in answer to the charge of implication in the bloody work of June:—"I declare, with the authority of a conscience without reproach, that I have never had a hand in any plot, in any attempt of violence, in any disorder—and that to spare the pain of such to my country, I would with joy have given all the blood in my veins."—*Jerrold's Newspaper.*

## Gleanings from Foreign Publications.

A society called "the Suburban Village Association," has just been established in London for constructing houses on the lines of railway in the suburbs, for artisans and others off limited income, the rent to include a daily ticket to and from London.

It is a curious fact, that the most carnivorous quadrupeds are more averse to devouring women than men. The bears of Kamschatka follow the women, while gathering wild flowers, into the woods and though most rapacious animals, seldom do more harm than robbing them of their fruit.—*Medical Times.*

On a proposition in the United States senate to exclude Slavery from Oregon, Mr Calhoun attacked the "Declaration of Independence," denying its position that "all men are born free and equal." He foresaw danger to the Union from the adoption of this "error;" and not to the Union only, but to all the world.—Well done, Republican!—*Jerrold's Newspaper.*

The *Nonconformist* says of the class fond of decrying Lamartine: "Imagine them driving their quills in the same spirit some two centuries ago! How they would have pohed about, and turned over and over, and smelt at, and cried 'Pah!' at such men as John Milton or Oliver Cromwell!"

HONOURS TO MEDICAL MEN IN FRANCE.—The *Moniteur* contains the names of twenty two surgeons of the National Guards of Paris and the environs, who, in recompense of their services in the June insurrection, have received the Cross of the Legion of Honour. Three have been raised to the rank of officers of the Legion, the rest are knights.—Two other medical men have obtained the same distinction, for having fought bravely in the ranks of the National Guard.

THE PRINCE DE JOINVILLE'S SKETCH.—Mrs. Hulton having become the possessor of of the drawing, by Prince de Joinville, of the *Ocean Monarch* on fire, she is getting it lithographed, and the proceeds of the sale will be given for the benefit of the Sailor's Home. The print will be a spirited tinted lithograph, executed by the Messrs. Maclure, Macdonald, and Macgregor. From the interest excited by the princely conduct of the author of the above sketch, on the late melancholy occasion which it represents, and the object for which the proceeds are to be devoted, a very extensive sale may be calculated upon.—*Liverpool Albion.*

PEACE DEMONSTRATION IN PARIS.—Most of our readers are probably aware that Elihu Burritt has for many months past been making arrangements for a strong Peace Demonstration in Paris, which was to have taken place much earlier than this, had not the unsettled state of affairs which resulted in the recent dreadful events there, put it quite out of the question for a time. Now, however, it seems to be definitely arranged that the proposed Convention shall be held during the first or second week in the present month.—*Peace Advocate.*

LAMARTINE'S WISH.—The "Bien Public," in reference to a paragraph in the "Siecle," in which the writer asks where M. de Lamartine was when, according to a deposition before the committee of investigation, the Provisional Government had accepted the red flag, says—"He was on the stairs of the Hotel de Ville, on the steps and on the square attempting to remove the red flag whilst the people were shouting "La tete de Lamartine!" It was at this moment that he made a reply which produced an effect even on the vociferators—'My head, citizens! would to God you all had it on your shoulders.'"

The celebrated Chandos Portrait of Shakspeare, which was bought for the Earl of Ellesmore, for 355 guineas is thus described—

"The celebrated Chandos Portrait of Shakspeare. This renowned portrait is said to be the work of Burbage, the first actor of Richard III, who is known to have handled the pencil. It then became the property of Joseph Taylor, the poet's Hamlet, who, dying about the year 1658, left it by will to Sir William D'Avenant. At the death of Sir William, in 1653, it was bought by Betterton, the actor, and when he died, Mr. Robert Keck, of the Inner Temple, gave Mrs. Barry, the actress, forty guineas for it. From Mr. Keck it passed to Mr Nicoll, of Minchenden House, Southgate, whose only daughter and heiress, Margaret, married James Marquis of Carnarvon, afterwards Duke of Chandos, from whom it descended in right of his wife Anna Eliza, the late Duchess, to the present Duke of Buckingham and Chandos."

Notwithstanding these details, the learned in such matters are divided in their opinions as to the authenticity of the portrait.

THE RUINED CITIES OF CENTRAL AMERICA.—When the Europeans first landed, the American was probably a race not on the ascending, but descending, series, gradually becoming extinct. They had probably passed through countless periods of existence, and were merely living on the crumbs of a past generation—the race who built and inhabited Copan. How mysterious are these ruined cities of Central America! Hieroglyphics, pyramids, mummies, columns like those of Luxor, but on a smaller scale! Egypt rediscovered as reproduced in Central America. Ye theorists, what say ye now? Were these remains of former grandeur the work of the forefathers of the present race of American Aborigines? or, as these have altered somewhat since the days of the Incas and the Montezumas, were they constructed by the former Mexicans and Peruvians? I should think not exactly. They must have been instructed by, or copied from others. Perhaps the continents were at one time joined where the Atlantic surge now rolls, and architects from Egypt and Northern Africa, from the land of the Guanches, in fact, assisted the American aborigines in raising structures whose meaning they did not possibly comprehend.—*Dr Knox's Races of Men* (*Medical Times*).

There is a story current in the clubs of London, for the last week or ten days, which, if not true to the letter, we believe at least to be founded on fact. It is said that Louis Blanc fled so hastily from Paris that he had no change of linen, and was provided only with notes of the Bank of France for his *frais de rout*. In such a plight he was when he took shipping at Ostend for Dover, and in the passage across, having made acquaintance with a Conservative gentleman, he told his tale—exhibited a roll of 1,000f. notes of the Bank of France, stating that he could find nobody to change them, and lamented the "*embarris*" in which he was thus placed. "If that be all," said the worthy Conservative "give yourself no trouble about it. Nobody can differ more essentially from your opinions, political and social, than I do; and if I were a Frenchman in February and March I would have combatted your principles to the death. But you are *now* an exile and a wanderer, seeking hospitality in England, and under such circumstances you must permit me to arrange matters with the steward and with the railroad, and you shall repay me when I procure for you the change of one of your *billets de banque*, in London." This was considerate, was humane, was gentlemanly, and we trust the majority of our brethren of the press will pursue as considerate and humane a line of conduct in dealing with political exiles, whether monarchical or democratic.—*London Morning Herald.*


### LOCAL AGENTS FOR THE STANDARD.

DR. DAVID M. DAVIS, Woodstown, N. J.
CHARLES ATKINSON, Marion, Grant co. Ia.
J. MILLER M'KIM, Philadelphia, Pa.
AMARANCY PAINE, Providence, R. I.
PLINY SEXTON, Palmyra, "
J. C. HATHAWAY, Farmington, Ontario co. N. Y.
THOMAS McCLINTOCK, Waterloo,
S. HOWLAND, Sherwood's Corners, Cayuga co. N. Y.
S. STAMFORD ASHLEY, Oberlin, Ohio,
ROBERT F. WALLCUT, Boston, Mass.
JESSE HOLMES, New Lisbon, Columbiana co. Ohio,
K. G. THOMAS, Marlborough, Stark co. "
ISAAC LEWIS, Short Creek, Harrison co. "
E. D. HUDSON, Springfield, Mass.
JAMES A. BURR, Ludlowville, N. Y.
ROBERT C. MARSHALL, Hiram Portage co.
WILLIAM CRONK, Buffalo, N. Y.
GEORGE W. EASTON, Bridgewater, Mass.
DAVID D. COOK, Johnson's Creek, Niagara co. N. Y.
A. H. BIGELOW, Concord, Mass.
L. G. THOMAS, West Winfield, N. Y.
JOHN W. LYON, Hastings, Oswego co. N. Y.
MORRIS KINGSBURY, Fulton, "
CHARLES DOUGLASS, Caughnawa, "
ALEX. FOREMAN, Pulaski, "
JOHN P. DICKINSON, Cleveland, "
SOLOMON PECK, Mexicoville, "
JOHN WILBUR, 2d. North Easton, Washington co. N. Y.
JONATHAN WILDE, Quaker Springs, Saratoga co. N. Y.